

# METHODIST REVIEW.

---

JANUARY, 1888.

---

## ART. I.—BISHOP WILLIAM LOGAN HARRIS.

MAN is the product of his original inheritance acted upon by the material universe, other men, and the spirit and providence of God. If this were all, responsibility would be a fiction; there would be no place for praise or blame. But, because of the inscrutable mystery of human freedom, of which all are conscious, the study of human character and conduct reveals merit and demerit, and fixes the true rank that men should hold among their fellows.

Infinite knowledge alone could write an infallible biography. In all critiques of human careers much of fiction must exist. Yet the accumulated wisdom of the race, the standards of comparison adopted, the clear light of publicity, which in this age illuminates through the press and enlarged intercourse what in former times would have been wrapped in impenetrable obscurity, justify the conclusion that patient attention to details and the intelligent use of every facility afforded will give better approximate results in the estimation of character than it was possible, except in a few cases, to attain in past ages.

Especially is this true in such an association as the Methodist Episcopal Church, an organization which interlinks its ministers more closely than any other ecclesiastical fabric ever constructed except Roman Catholicism, and differs from that especially in the greater degree of publicity which attends its proceedings. Where Rome works in secret, by forces often-times as relentless and resistless as fate, Methodism debates in public and examines the character of its ministers in the

glare of day. That it is possible to tell "from books," as Daniel did certain things, where every regular minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church was in any year of his whole ministry during the hundred years and more covered by its records; to ascertain in a few moments when he was received, and where; when he was ordained, and by whom; with what stations he was intrusted, and when, where, and generally under what circumstances he died; whether his position was exalted or obscure; and that the successive steps of his promotion can be traced as accurately as the records of nature in the rings of a tree or the growth of geological formations, is without a parallel in the archives either of civil or of ecclesiastical establishments.

The parents of William L. Harris were farmers, belonging to that sturdy yeomanry which laid the foundations of the States of the central West. They possessed enterprise; for, lured by the promise of great results to industry, frugality, and sagacity, in a time before railroads were introduced, when towns and even villages were few and far between, they went to what was then the far West. Ohio, it is true, was early settled, and from the beginning by a class of persons who carried with them settled habits, and therefore formed communities far above the camping-places of hunters and explorers of the Daniel Boone type. It was not their purpose to move on as soon as civilization overtook them, but to carry civilization with them, and as soon as possible improve their homes and surround them with schools and churches.

It is almost superfluous to say that settlers in the West in those days possessed unusual physical vigor; for if a few, deceived as to the hardships they had to encounter, began the journey without the endurance necessary to succeed, they seldom had the strength or perseverance to complete it. The life also, though full of exposure, tended to conserve and strengthen the original constitution. The world recognizes the fact that none of the colonies of ancient or modern times were founded by a hardier and more enduring set of men than those who, not content to remain in the still partly undeveloped States of the East, pushed forth, unaffrighted by the war-whoop of the Indian, the howl of the wolf, the growl of the bear, or the malarious effluvia of undrained swamps or sluggish rivers, to

find a dwelling-place amid the living, the decaying, and the dead vegetation of centuries.

It was also a period in which what was known was thought out and more vigorously grasped than at the present time—when masses of thought, launched by the press and intellectually swallowed without mastication, are daily passing through, rather than incorporating themselves with, the mind. Abundant evidence shows that the farmers, mechanics, and average citizens of every type had but few ideas, but conceived those clearly and held them tenaciously. The school-books, readers, and the few works possessed by religiously-inclined families, still to be found in the garrets of those who inherit the relics of a preceding generation, as well as the speeches of political and other orators, and the few histories of those times prepared by contemporary writers, illustrate the difference between the past and the present in these particulars.

From such an ancestry, physically, mentally, and morally, William L. Harris received the best inheritance—a sound mind in a sound body, and traditions of homely virtues and self-reliance. Religiously, his parents were Presbyterians, and this meant a great deal for him. Presbyterianism, in the early days of this republic, was intensely doctrinal, necessarily systematic, practical, immovable, reverent, conscientious, and so clearly defined as to stand out before the eyes of its votaries and of the public with great distinctness as a theological system. Its ministers were reasoners rather than orators, proving, defining, and illustrating, not from natural science nor to any great extent from social life, but from the word of God. Presbyterians always made much of the holy Scriptures, and inculcated the importance of committing its words to memory. From Scotland it derived most of its accessions, though England and the north of Ireland furnished many of its strongest men.

Fortunately for their children, Mr. and Mrs. Harris had fallen under the influence of George Whitefield and of those ministers who affiliated with him, and the predestinarian view was suffused with emotion, and to a great extent lost its hardness; and the family, not content with believing themselves of the number of the elect and leaving the universe to its fate under the influence of the impenetrable will of its sovereign God,

cherished the deepest interest in the conversion of those whom Providence had committed to their care.

At the age of fourteen years a tinge of sadness was thrown over the mind and heart of William L. Harris by the death of his father. He was old enough to feel to some extent the pathos of the word "fatherless," yet not sufficiently advanced to develop that self-reliance and insensibility which dispose of such an event simply as one of the inevitable occurrences of life. In that primitive day, the death of the husband before the lands he had taken were fully improved, even if entirely paid for, rarely the case, left the widow with a serious burden. It is an error, however, to say that the parents of William L. Harris were poor, or that the family was broken up. Since his demise some eloquent discourses have been rendered pathetic by descriptions of the sufferings of the youth because of the poverty of his widowed mother, one speaker having gone so far as to represent them as driven from home under the inexorable sentence of a sheriff's sale. The widow continued to reside upon the farm for many years, and assisted her son in procuring his education; and when the property was finally disposed of he received as his patrimony what for those times was quite a large sum. On one occasion he brought home from the executors a thousand silver dollars, the weight of which—as he pleasantly remarked—"was enough, as was generally the case with riches, to be a millstone around his neck."

Fortunately, however, he was obliged to earn his own living. His uncle, practically his guardian, did not believe that it was wise for him to seek an education, but wished him to continue to work upon the farm; and was not willing to give him any portion of the estate to assist in his studies. But his mother always sympathized with him, and to her interest and his own exertions he owed his rapid progress as well as his early entrance upon educational work.

It was on the 14th of November, 1817, near Mansfield, O., that he of whom I write was born; only fourteen years after the State had been admitted into the Union, and less than thirty years after the first permanent settlement was made at Marietta. At the time of his birth the population of Cleveland was less than three hundred; Cincinnati, less than seven thousand; Dayton had hardly the dignity of a village; and Co-

lumbus, though it had been the capital for five years, had less than a thousand.

Those were the days of the simplicity, power, and corresponding usefulness of camp-meetings. They had no expensive houses, or even comfortable cottages; there were no auditoriums, trained choirs, or instruments of music; but simply the tents of Israel under the palm-trees and the cedars of Lebanon. The preachers and the people sought power with God and men. They preached to convict sinners; to convert them from the error of their ways; to instruct penitents, and lead men out of darkness into the light. Multitudes came from curiosity, or to be pleasurabley affected by the novel sight, but of these many "remained to pray." Such scenes made powerful impressions upon youth. "The groves were God's first temples," and early Methodism found that on such occasions the Lord would frequently "suddenly come to his temple." Vast audiences felt his Presence. Cries for mercy and even agonizing shrieks arose, "commingling on the holy air" with the triumphant shouts of those who had passed from death unto life, or of saints who had received such a blessing that there was not room to contain it. The moral force of many of these meetings was so great that it could not have been intensified had one risen from the dead. A hundred miracles of healing, and of speaking with divers tongues, or of withering fig-trees, or of stilling the tempestuous waves of the sea, would not have produced a deeper sense of the reality of religion, the nearness of death, or of the irreversible doom to be pronounced at the day of judgment, than did the spectacle of a minister absorbed in his awful theme, surrounded by scores of others engaged in prayer for the descent, in saving power, of the Holy Spirit, and an assembly of hundreds or thousands fused into one spirit and one voice, while men and women, drawn by apparently resistless influences as into a whirlpool, rushed toward the altar and prostrated themselves upon the ground crying, "What shall we do to be saved?"

Among those who were awakened on such an occasion was a lad, not seventeen years old, who found the new life June 10, 1834. The name of the minister who preached the sermon on that day we do not know, nor does it matter; for under such circumstances the minister is but a trumpet; the

entire assembly preaches. What he might have been if this forest call had not summoned him to prayer none can tell ; energy such as his would have found an outlet, even if compelled to wear its own channel. Whether he had in view the ministry from the beginning is a question which cannot be determined. It was not uncommon for boys of even fourteen years to be urged to give their experience, and a youth who had attained his full height at seventeen, with a manly voice, might readily have been selected as one from whom the Church could expect great things if it should "please the Lord to call him into the ministry," or, as it was commonly called, "out into the work." Be this as it may, he began at once to study, and for two years received instruction in ancient languages and mathematics at Norwalk, Ohio.

In 1836, not yet nineteen years old, he received a license to preach, and was employed by the presiding elder. It was a cause of regret to him in subsequent years that he entered upon the ministry so young, but he regarded the fact that he was under the special supervision of the presiding elder as a modifying influence of considerable value. He said, "What could a lad of my age have done without the guidance and sympathy of a superior?"

In 1837 he was received as a probationer into the Michigan Conference, which then comprised the whole State of Michigan and the northern part of the State of Ohio. His first appointment from the Conference was Dover Circuit, where he was junior preacher. In 1838 he was stationed as junior preacher at Wooster. In 1839 he was ordained Deacon and stationed at Mansfield, near his birthplace, with Adam Poe as his senior. On the 9th of August, 1840, he was married to the daughter of Jesse and Nancy Atwell, the maiden name of her mother being Rice. This event he always counted one of the most clearly providential of his life.

The North Ohio Conference was formed in the year 1840, and he was among the members of the Michigan Conference of which it was composed. He was stationed at Belleville. In 1841 he was made the first preacher at Amity, the Conference meeting at Wooster, where three years before he had been stationed. In this year he was ordained Elder. His success being marked, he was returned for a second year. In

1843 his appointment was in Chesterville. In 1842 the city of Delaware, O., had purchased "the property of a watering-place known as White Sulphur Springs," and offered \$10,000 in money to the Methodists if they would there establish an institution of learning of the grade of a college. The offer was accepted. On the 13th of November, 1844, the Ohio Wesleyan University was opened, with Edward Thomson as president. In the beginning of the autumn of that year William L. Harris was stationed at Delaware.

In his early ministry his preaching was accompanied with great spiritual power. On all his circuits and stations there were revivals. On one four hundred were added to the Church, and these were mostly heads of families, some of whom remain till this day, occupying the most important places in the local societies to which they belong. His physical energy bore the toil without being conscious of it, and his systematic habits prevented any of the lambs of the flock from languishing from lack of pastoral care.

Professor W. G. Williams, who resided in Delaware during Mr. Harris's ministry as pastor of the church, informs me that he was "earnest and fervent, loud, though never boisterous; but often so eager in his utterances that in the bubbling overflow of words an impediment of speech would appear." Professor Williams observed that this impediment never entirely disappeared except when he prepared his matter and became more deliberate. The more nearly he approached extemporaneousness in his utterances the more liable it was to appear.

Professor Williams speaks of one commendable peculiarity which Bishop Harris had in that early day, and which never left him. This won the writer's admiration the first time he ever saw him, and is a trait that might well be imitated by every young minister, and by all, without regard to age, who desire to recommend the religion of Jesus Christ to the favorable consideration of intelligent persons. It is thus described by Professor Williams:

He had one elocutionary excellence in a marked degree—there was no professional tone in his voice or mannerism in his bearing or gestures. However solemn the occasion or the theme, he spoke in a natural, manly, unaffected style, without cant or sanctimoniousness. Always dignified and serious in his bearing as a

minister, yet his style and delivery were such as might be used in any situation. I do not think it was different when he spoke in deliberative bodies, or that it would have been varied or thought amiss had he spoken in a civil court or on a rostrum. . . . He always spoke in a clear, resonant voice, and with very distinct articulation. The farthest person in his audience could hear every syllable that he uttered, so that it was easy and pleasant to follow him. His manner was more colloquial than oratorical. His audiences always listened, because he always had something to say to them.

During the period that he was connected with the University it was seldom that audiences were agitated by his sermons or speeches. In those days he seemed better fitted to instruct than to stir men. It was natural enough, therefore, that at the end of one year he should become tutor in the University. But underneath the teacher was the evangelist, and he longed for the heat and glow of revival services. At the end of the next year he resigned the position and returned to the pastorate, and was stationed at Toledo, then just founded. Toledo is well laid out, chiefly on high ground, and has for some years been considered one of the most healthful cities of the West. Even as long ago as 1860, before its drainage system was complete, its inhabitants boasted—and with truth—that the number of deaths averaged but little over two per cent. of the whole population. But when William L. Harris was stationed there it was one of the most fever-breeding places along the lakes. He was soon attacked by malaria, and though he was removed to Norwalk at the end of the year he was so enervated and depressed that he made up his mind he would be unable to endure the strain of the pastorate.

In 1848 he was appointed principal of Baldwin Institute, the germ of Baldwin University, where he continued until 1851. Being very successful, he was called back to Delaware to take the management of the preparatory academy. There, under the eyes of the president, faculty, and trustees, by his thoroughness, versatility, industry, and facility in teaching and kindling enthusiasm, he commanded such respect and confidence that he was elected to the chair of chemistry and natural history in the University in 1852, a position he held for eight years.

That I might not be misled, either by my own admiration for

the man or the enthusiastic words spoken by friends after his death, I wrote to Professor Williams, above mentioned, for a candid, unexaggerated statement of the qualities of Professor Harris as a student and teacher. He says:

As a student Harris had a *genius* for hard work. He was avid of knowledge, and must have been a faithful and successful toiler in the field of general learning as well as special theological study. During the eight years of his ministry before he came to Delaware he had already acquired a fair working library, and knew how to use it. In the first year of my acquaintance with him we studied a good deal together, and during one year he came regularly to my room in the University at four o'clock in the morning to study Hebrew. The first year he was in the faculty as teacher in the preparatory department he found time to go over the entire mathematical course, and when a few years later he returned to us as professor of natural science he took up and rapidly mastered the wide range of studies in his own department. His fondness for books and hard study never left him. I think that when he was with us he was more disposed to bend over his books than over his pen; yet he wrote a good deal, and I suppose must have accumulated a large mass of sermons and lectures.

As a teacher, it is said that he particularly excelled in inducing students to think for themselves and perform original work. Certainly to do this is to reach the highest rank as a teacher. It was a complaint made against a certain very popular teacher by one of his most celebrated pupils that "he always entertained us delightfully, but now I cannot remember any thing that he said, and have no general knowledge of the subject." Such a criticism could never with truth be uttered against Professor Harris as a teacher. His proficiency in Hebrew became so great that he had classes therein in addition to the duties of his professorship; and some of the professors did not think it beneath them to pursue their studies in that language under his tuition.

Thus it appears that, though not an alumnus of any college, he made himself master of all that is taught in college, becoming tutor and professor. He had all the advantages of self-made men—self-reliance, a prodigious memory of his acquisitions, and an investigating spirit, with the conscious necessity for special attention to details; but he escaped in great measure their defects, which originate chiefly in their not associating with equals or superiors.

He was elected secretary of the North Ohio Conference in the year 1851, and performed its duties in such a manner as to win the respect and gratitude of the entire Conference. Men who had said that he was a born professor now declared that he was a born secretary. There is not so great a difference between the qualities required for these positions as might be supposed. Method, accuracy, attention, and promptitude are demanded by them in common, while animation, so necessary to make the recitation-room a scene of interest, can in a secretary prevent the necessary details of business from becoming dry as dust.

A comparison of dates reveals to the reader, familiar with the history of this country and of the Methodist Episcopal Church, that the public career of William L. Harris began when slavery was the burning question in Church and State. The year that he was licensed to preach, in Cincinnati, not far from the spot where he was lifting up his youthful voice, the General Conference of 1836 writhed in the grasp of the monster, and by vote censured George Storrs and Samuel Norris for attending an abolition meeting. In 1844, the year that he was appointed to Delaware, the Church was divided, and Bishop Soule—whom he had regarded as the Nestor of Methodism—turned his back upon the place of his birth and the scenes of his life previous to his election to the episcopacy, and went with the South. Then followed the great suit for the division of the property between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which in the Supreme Court of the United States was indeed a battle of the giants; the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, being represented by Daniel Lord, Reverdy Johnson, and his son; the Methodist Episcopal Church by Rufus Choate, George Wood, and E. L. Fancher. In all of this Professor Harris was deeply interested. In 1848 and 1852 various phases of the subject were under discussion; upon all he had opinions and uttered them without reserve. He was a pronounced abolitionist before abolition became popular in State or Church, but can hardly be said to have been a leader in the movement. This probably arose from an absence of opportunity or occasion to manifest special interest, except as he mingled with the ministers of his Conference. He lived during all his public

life in small towns, particularly in Delaware, where the anti-slavery sentiment was prominent, if not dominant. There was not much need within his immediate sphere for propagandism of such views; there was very rarely any occasion for personal participation in the struggle; yet he both spoke and wrote on the subject, and, as his surviving friends of Delaware say, "It was understood that if ever a call should come for action he was ready to announce a more aggressive position."

The time came when he was first elected delegate to the General Conference, which sat in Indianapolis in 1856. As nearly the entire Conference to which he belonged was anti-slavery, there was no issue upon that point. His election was a triumph of personal popularity and a tribute to his extraordinary services as secretary, one of his friends saying: "A good secretary deserves one election; after that he has no claims on the Conference unless he proves himself a good representative." It was an astonishment to himself to find that he was at the head of the delegation of eight, with his distinguished and revered president, Dr. Edward Thomson, second. So great a shock was this to conventional ideas that a friend expostulated with Professor Harris somewhat as follows:

You have committed an offense against propriety. The idea of your being first and Dr. Thomson second! You should resign at once, and declare that under no circumstances can you consent to occupy such a position.

But William L. Harris was at that time thirty-nine years old, and he responded:

I did not desire to be first; I did not make myself first. It is the result of an election, and I do not see that I can do any thing about it further than to accept the responsibility put upon me.

Every person familiar with his work as secretary in the North Ohio Conference recognized his pre-eminent fitness for the secretaryship of General Conference; but in addition to that he was considered a representative antislavery candidate, in opposition to the reactionary tendency which had appeared in many sections of the Church. The whole number of votes cast upon that occasion was 206, making 104 necessary for a choice. Of these William L. Harris received 113.

He was elected to the General Conferences of 1860, '64, '68,

and '72, and in every instance at the head of his delegation; and by all these General Conferences he was elected secretary by acclamation. No deliberative body, in whatever sphere its powers were exercised, ever had a more capable and efficient secretary. In comprehension, attention, accuracy, voice, and manner he could scarcely have been excelled. So transcendent was his excellency that some have said that the Methodist Episcopal Church never had a secretary before him. If it be not necessary to say so much, the reading of the Journal prior to his time will convince any one of his great superiority to all who went before him. It is a gift to do such things well, and he possessed it in a high degree.

For twenty-four years he applied the same talents in the same general methods to the editing of the Discipline, making therein improvements fully as marked as those in the Journals, and even more useful; and after he was elected bishop it was the desire of the Church that he should continue to edit the Discipline. It is now, in the opinion of competent lawyers, the best distributed and most luminous statement of law, of the same or similar proportions, in the English language. Nearly every change made by Bishop Harris has possessed self-evident merit, and therefore elicited little or no criticism.

Shortly after the General Conference of 1856 it became obvious that a change in the rules on the subject of slave-holding by Church members, or a new chapter on the subject in the Discipline, or both, would be the next step in the legislative history of the Church upon this question. Professor William L. Harris was a pronounced advocate of the most vigorous measures, believing that there never could be permanent peace in the Church until all controversy on this subject should be rendered impossible by unequivocal utterances. He now came forward as a representative of that view, and for some years engaged in a vigorous controversy, in the various official papers and other proper places, with men most distinguished by abilities and official position in the Church. The question most debated was the powers of the General Conference. In preparing for its discussion Professor Harris compiled several large scrap-books, in which the papers bearing on the subject of slavery in the Church and the powers of the General Conference to legislate upon it, which for a long series of years

had appeared in the official papers, including reports of speeches delivered by eminent persons, were arranged in chronological order. When he entered the arena he was armed at all points, equipped with every thing except what was necessary for *retreat*; for such accouterments he seldom had need.

The substance of his arguments upon this subject was finally given to the public in a work entitled, *The Constitutional Powers of the General Conference, with a special application to the subject of Slave-holding.* In the introduction he says:

When I wrote the articles, the substance of which is given in the following pages, it was not my expectation that they would have any thing more than a merely ephemeral newspaper existence. Soon after their publication I received letters from many ministers, some of whom occupy high positions in the Church, fully indorsing my doctrines, and calling for the argument in a more permanent form. The Delaware Annual Conference, of which I have the honor to be a member, at its session in 1858 unanimously adopted the following resolution, namely :

"Resolved, That we fully indorse the views of Dr. Harris in his argument on the constitutional powers of the General Conference as published in the *Western Christian Advocate*, and that this Conference respectfully requests him to publish his articles in a more permanent form."

The same Conference, at its session in 1859, with the same unanimity passed the following resolution, namely :

"Resolved, That we again request Dr. Harris to publish his argument on the constitutional powers of the General Conference in a more permanent form."

Not feeling at liberty longer to decline meeting the wishes of my own Conference, and of so many friends of the ministry in other Conferences, I have amplified the articles somewhat, for the purpose of noticing objections which have been made to my doctrines since they were first published; and, foregoing my own preferences and yielding to the solicitations of others, I now send them forth in this unpretending little volume, asking only that it be read and its arguments refuted before its doctrines be condemned.

That introduction excellently exhibits the frankness, simplicity, and directness of the style of Bishop Harris. In concluding his observations he says:

If in the course of the argument I have advocated any erroneous opinions, the obvious remedy is to refute them. I am utterly

unconscious of having made use of a fallacy, or of having misconstrued or misapplied authorities, or of having substituted declamation for argument ; but if any such defects exist it is easy to point them out.

The book is divided into six chapters : I. Powers Granted to a Delegated General Conference. II. Does the Constitution of the Church Forbid the General Conference to make a rule Prohibiting Slave-holding in the Church ? III. Does the General Rule on Slavery Authorize Slave-holding ? IV. General Rules and Terms of Membership. V. Recapitulation of the Argument and Authorities. VI. Perils of the Membership.

The subsequent action of the Church shows that a large majority of its members were convinced of the soundness of his position. In 1856 the degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred upon him by Allegheny College, and he became familiarly known from that time as Dr. Harris. In 1860 he was elected Assistant Corresponding Secretary of the Missionary Society. The whole number of votes cast was 218, of which he had 141; thirty-one more than the number necessary to a choice. Between the senior secretary, Dr. Durbin, and the new assistant secretary there was a great contrast. Dr. Durbin was seventeen years the elder and, though small of stature and weak in voice, was unsurpassed as an orator, an admirable organizer and man of affairs; but his physical and mental force had culminated and was waning, though very slowly. He was already sixty years of age. The new secretary was of giant frame and of inexhaustible endurance. "He never knew what it was to be tired" till he was more than sixty-eight years old. His voice was powerful, and the more work he had to do the happier he seemed. Gradually all the work of the office drifted into his hands as his venerable senior approached and passed three-score and ten. In travel, in business sagacity, in details, in concise and lucid correspondence, in luminous arrangement of matters to be submitted to the board of managers, the General Missionary Committee, the Annual Conferences, and in the reports, he was a constant wonder—or, rather, his work ceased to be wonderful because it was constant.

Meanwhile he continued to discharge the functions of secretary of successive General Conferences, and exercised a powerful influence over legislation. In the General Conference of

1864 he voted against electing the presiding elders by ballot without debate in the Annual Conferences, on the nomination of the presiding bishop. In the same Conference he voted to extend the time of the pastoral term from two to three years; also for the change of the sections on class-meetings. He also proposed the amendment in the report of the Committee on the Centenary of Methodism so as to make it read:

The local funds shall be appropriated to the cause of Education and Church Extension under the direction of a committee consisting of an equal number of ministers and laymen appointed by the several Annual Conferences within whose bounds they are raised.

He made the principal motions affecting the plans for the organization of colored Conferences, after having made the preliminary motion to authorize the bishops to present such a paper as they thought would promote the interests of the cause.

In the General Conference of 1868 he took a most important part, practically controlling the action of the body on the great question of the admission of Mission Conferences:

*General Conference 1868, Proceedings of May 11.*

W. L. Harris did not propose to consume time by talking upon this question, but he did desire to have the motions, resolutions, amendments, etc., proposed put in such form that he could vote for the admission without declaring, either in form or substance, that the action of the last General Conference in imposing these restrictions was unconstitutional. He knew it was not in order to present resolutions or motions here, but he had some resolutions which he would read as a part of his speech:

"*Resolved*, 1. That all action of the General Conference of 1864 restricting, or purporting to restrict, the rights and privileges of the Annual Conferences which the bishops were authorized by the said General Conference to form within the United States and Territories be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

"*Resolved*, 2. That the following Conferences, namely, Alabama, Delaware, Georgia, Holston, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and North Carolina, and Washington, are hereby declared to be Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and vested with all the rights, privileges, and immunities usual to Annual Conferences of said Church.

"*Resolved*, 3. That the provisional delegates elected by the aforesaid Conferences severally are hereby admitted to membership in this General Conference, entitled to exercise the same rights, powers, and privileges as delegates from other Annual

Conferences; *provided* always, that they shall be found otherwise qualified according to the law of the Church.

"*Resolved*, 4. That a committee of seven be appointed, to which shall be referred the credentials of the said provisional delegates, together with so much of the Journals of the said Conferences as relates to their election, and that the committee report thereon at the earliest practicable moment."

W. L. Harris then offered the resolution read by him this morning, and moved that upon these resolutions the Conference proceed to vote without debate, provided that this shall not preclude any substitutes, motions, or amendments relating to these, but that on these the question shall be taken without debate. . . .

The motion prevailed.

The question then recurred upon the resolution offered by W. L. Harris.

The resolutions were taken up *seriatim*, and adopted.

The third resolution, as adopted, is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the provisional delegates elected to this body by the aforesaid Conferences severally are hereby admitted to membership in this General Conference on the presentation of the requisite credentials."

He also took a very active part in the preparation of the plan by which lay representation was introduced.

In 1870, the degree of LL.D. was conferred upon him by Baldwin University.

Such had been his career when, in 1872, eight bishops were elected. The first was the slender Thomas Bowman; the second, the massive William Logan Harris. Who but He who seeth the end from the beginning could have thought that the strong man would bow himself and go to his long home leaving his apparently fragile colleague still the senior bishop?

Immediately upon the organization of the new board he was by common consent elected secretary; a most important office, for by means of it the Church is apprised of the times of assembling of all the Conferences, and of many other facts necessary to its harmonious working, and also the rules, decisions, and, to a great extent, the traditions of the bishops are preserved, so as to unify the administration in successive years. It was soon obvious that he intended to apply to the duties of his episcopal functions what Bishop Foss in a memorial address appropriately described as "a three-man power of work." From travel, exposure, and toil of every kind he never shrank. A telegram from a colleague indicating that he

was ill or weary received an almost immediate response, "I will hold your Conference."

In the May following his election he went around the world by the way of San Francisco, visiting successively Japan, China, India, Bulgaria, and western Europe. Leaving San Francisco on the 16th of June, by the 24th of September he had reached Kiukiang, having in the meantime spent a month in Japan organizing the mission there, and visited Shanghai and Peking. During his stay in China he also visited Foochow and other points, presiding at the Conferences. He spent about two months in India, traveling thoroughly; presiding at the Conference at Lucknow on January 7; making a detour on his own account to Palestine, and reaching Rome on the 1st of April. He then visited Turkey, and afterward held all the European Conferences, the entire journey occupying eighteen months. Again, in 1880 he made an extensive tour through Mexico, and in 1881 he spent three months in South America, and sailed thence to Europe, where he held our European Conferences, and reached home about nine months after he left. In the winter of 1884-85 he visited Mexico again, and had it not been contrary to the judgment of his colleagues he would have visited Liberia, and in that case, as in every other, would have brought home most valuable practical information.

Reflection upon the foregoing career, which could without repetition be expanded into a large volume, justifies the characterization of him that I have made elsewhere as a genius in ecclesiastical affairs. His characteristics were massive strength, physical and mental. There was an unusual combination of intellectual activity with a ponderous physical frame. A marked peculiarity of his mind was quickness and depth of penetration. His judgment of principles was sound, and his familiarity with precedents complete. These he valued highly, as reflecting light in the interpretation of the meaning of laws, but he was capable of independent reasoning upon principles; and some of the most important elements now in our ecclesiastical system or practice were first thought out or clearly stated by him. He was an advisory member of the committees of the General Conference on the revision of the jurisprudence of the Church, and, in fact, of most important committees and commissions for many years.

Methodist history he loved as young people love romances. In ascertaining disputed facts, collating different editions of the Discipline, Minutes, and Journals, examining manuscripts and ancient letters, he was as happy as a child among playthings. No question was ever raised as to what any thing meant which Bishop Harris said or wrote. In business meetings his resources were always at command ; his energy in delivery on such occasions never failed ; indeed, his short speeches every-where were models of crisp, clear statement.

As a bishop his most conspicuous qualities were those of a parliamentarian and an administrator. His judgment was sound, and though his natural abruptness of speech often gave the impression that he was incensed or irritated it was rarely the case, and when it did occur soon passed away. He was always very tenacious of his rights, and if he considered them invaded would protest, regardless of the dignity of the person involved. An illustration of this can be found in the proceedings of the General Conference in 1860, under date of May 10 :

The secretary, Rev. W. L. Harris, rose to a question of privilege. The correspondent of the Cincinnati *Gazette*, in his letter of May 4, had referred to what he chose to term "a little scene," which occurred while he, the secretary, was reading the Journal on that morning. It was in reference to a remark between Bishop Ames and himself, and which the bishop had since said was only a pleasantry. Mr. Harris read the following extract from the letter referred to :

"During the reading of the Journal this morning by the secretary, Dr. Harris, a little 'scene' occurred. In reading the number of names appended to various antislavery petitions, by some singular coincidence the secretary very often gave them more signatures than they contained ; and, in the case of those petitions which prayed for no change, in one or two instances he gave them fewer names than were actually on them. As members rose all over the house to correct these errors, the chair, Bishop Ames, remarked that *the secretary's mistakes seemed to be all on one side*. Dr. Harris quite indignantly repelled the '*innuendo*,' as he called it. The chair explained that no impeachment of the secretary's integrity was intended, and so the matter dropped."

Mr. Harris said that in the very item which preceded the one he read, when Bishop Ames made the remark alluded to, he read a memorial against a change of the General Rule on Slavery from Freeport, Rock River Conference, and stated the number at twenty, when it should have been only seven, the very reverse of the correspondent's statement. He explained how this was occa-

sioned by the manner in which the person presenting the memorial had indorsed it. He called on Mr. Stoughton to corroborate his statement, which that gentleman did.

He was equally strenuous in favor of fair play. In 1860, when one of the minority moved that the operation of the previous question should be suspended during the consideration of the report on slavery, Dr. Harris seconded the amendment.

He was not a "society man," but was very communicative. One of the New York papers, in its excellent tribute to him, said : "With him dies more knowledge of Methodist affairs throughout the world than was possessed by any other man." This would have been true for any time during the past twelve years ; but it is not lost. He has communicated it to his colleagues and brethren in the ministry, to the members of the committees, and, though no *one* possesses it, it is the property of the Church.

Outside of what he conceived to be his authority, and of what he knew himself to have mastered, he was diffident. If it had not been so he would have written more. He did prepare a work, in conjunction with the late Judge Henry, on ecclesiastical law, for which he was pre-eminently fitted ; and it is said that he prepared and delivered at Drew two masterly discourses upon the relation of the bishops to the General Conference. It is to be hoped that these are in a condition to admit of publication.

At intervals, for some years before his death, he had had alarming attacks, of the cause of which his medical advisers were not certain. Early in the spring before his death he was attacked with vertigo and other distressing and dangerous symptoms ; and having always before traveled under the pressure of great responsibility, attending strictly to the business committed to his care, he concluded that he would go abroad for rest. For a time his health appeared to improve every hour, and he wrote home the most encouraging letters ; but suddenly an attack far more severe than any which he had ever had prostrated him. After he rallied somewhat he was brought home, and—his family being in the country at the time—was taken to a hotel. As soon as possible his residence was prepared, and he was removed thither.

In the midst of great physical suffering he met his fate

bravely, heroically: not with the heroism of the Indian chief who will not give his captors the pleasure of seeing any evidence of pain, but with the moral courage of the Christian. The following scene from his last rational moments exhibits him as the same straightforward man, "going forth to meet the unknown future with a steady step and an unfailing heart."

"You would be glad to recover and work longer?"

"Very, indeed."

"But if not?"

"The doctor in Liverpool told me that I was to make my arrangements, for I had but a few hours to live. I told him that I had not left the preparation for that hour till that hour. I say, I told him *I had not left the preparation for that hour till that hour.*"

"You are sure that it will be well?"

"I believe it with a steady and unwavering faith."

"Would you like me to pray with you?"

He roused himself, threw the whole force of his ordinary voice into his words, the full light came into his eye:

"My dear brother, you will greatly oblige me; *I believe in prayer.*"

Then with the tears of devotion and holy confidence flowing from his eyes he followed every petition. Afterward his pain increased, but once in his delirium he heard the voice of his son saying, "Father, do try to rest." He ceased his restless motion and said, "Rest, my son? Rest? *There is no rest here; rest is up there.*"

He was a laborer together with God, and it pleased God to answer in his death the prayer of Moses in the Psalm of Humanity: "And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us; and establish thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish thou it." For the work of William Logan Harris is so incorporated with the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church that neither it nor he can ever be forgotten.

JAMES M. BUCKLEY.

**ART. II.—ON SOME CONTROVERTED POINTS IN THE EXPOSITION OF THE SEVENTH CHAPTER OF ROMANS.**

THERE are two modes recognized by exegetical scholars of ascertaining the meaning of a passage of Scripture. One is, to take as "the starting-point the understanding of the details, in order to arrive at the understanding of the whole." The other is, "that the whole must be first understood in order to attain to the understanding of the individual parts."<sup>\*</sup> The former is the natural method, and one that must commend itself to the student of the holy Scriptures. The context, also, must be carefully studied, so as to secure a clear view of the relations of the passage to what goes before and what follows, and to the main purpose of the writer.

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the formulated doctrines which may be deduced from this paragraph, but to study some of the separate points on which controversy and wide divergences of opinion have arisen among New Testament scholars. This mode of approach to the meaning is necessarily incomplete, for it is as important to study the parts in the light of the context and of the purpose of the writer as it is to study the context and purpose of the writer in the light of its separate parts. Both methods are necessary to the thorough comprehension of the subject under consideration. This paper will be limited chiefly to the former method as a preparation for the latter.

The seventh chapter of Paul's letter to the Romans, especially the part beginning at the seventh verse and closing with the twenty-fifth, has been the subject of almost endless controversy. The diversity of views in the interpretation of this passage affords a clear illustration of the influence of subjective considerations over the normal exercise of the critical and logical powers. The early Church, especially the Greek Church, held one view. Augustine, following Methodius, gave emphasis to another exposition. His interpretation arose not so much from a critical study of the passage as from considerations of its application. Modern commentators have not hesitated to contend

\* Immer's *Hermeneutics*, Newman's translation, p. 212.

for their particular view on the ground that it is more favorable to the promotion of a high Christian life than the other.

While our opinions, environments, and experiences must, in a greater or less degree, affect our interpretation of a written document so intensely personal as this passage, it is nevertheless the duty of the expositor to reduce these influences to the minimum, and to study the passage as dispassionately as possible. He would not only be a bold but a rash and unscientific man who should discuss in a dogmatic spirit a passage so profound and difficult, and one on which so many pious thinkers of equal scholarship have differed so widely. It is proposed to touch some of the more salient points on which commentators have differed, in order to make apparent the lines of divergence. We will present these topics in the order in which they will naturally arrest the reader's attention.

The connection of the passage with the immediately preceding context requires mention. The tracing of the connection in Paul's writings is especially difficult. His frequent digressions, often without warning to the reader, involve the necessity of constant watchfulness to prevent confounding them with his main argument. The connection of this passage is shown by the question which the apostle at once asks: "Is the law sin?" This is the question an objector would naturally raise, and from the seventh to the thirteenth verse the apostle answers it by showing in his own past experience the blessed purpose of the law, and its blessed consequences as well. "Is the law sin?" On the contrary, "I had not known sin except through law." "By the law is the knowledge of sin." By its commands it shows the absolute rule of right, and by its rewards and penalties the attitude of God toward the actions of men. This will appear by reading the fifth verse with verses 7-13. If this stand-point of the apostle is properly interpreted it follows that from the fourteenth to the twenty-fifth verse there is a digression which is connected with what has gone before but not necessarily dependent on it. It is clear that this whole period has for its primary, if not exclusive, object the defense of the law against the attacks which the objectors had made upon it; showing that the law is not of the nature of sin, nor the cause of specific acts of transgression, but that which reveals sin to our apprehension and to our consciousness. We must assent to

the conclusion that the defense of the law is the primary object of the apostle in this passage: "I was alive without law once," Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ. The point of time indicated by *ποτέ* shows that it was not his state at the time of writing of which he speaks. There was a point in his history when he was alive, but afterward a new factor was introduced, namely, the commandment, at which point of time he died. This suddenness of the revival of sin, and of his death as a consequence of its revival, is shown by the employment of aorists throughout until the thirteenth verse. He argues the value of the law by showing what it had done for him. The argument of the apostle is certainly remarkable, and at first view seems to prove that the coming of the law was not a benefit but an injury. From a state of life he has been brought into a state of death; and yet the state of death was better than the life which he had enjoyed before the coming of the law. What is meant, then, by *being alive?* Dr. Beet says:

His death was that separation from the life of God which is the immediate result of the sentence already pronounced on the sinner; which at once brings spiritual corruption, from which nothing but spiritual resurrection can save, and which otherwise will inevitably be eternal. It stands in awful contrast to the life which is the believer's present possession, and which will develop into eternal life. . . . Before Paul entered upon this state of death he *was alive*. His life was evidently that which he lost by death. . . . Paul says that when the law came he lost it. When was he thus alive? Not in his sinful days. He says expressly (Eph. ii, 1-5) that he was then dead. To say that he was then alive is utterly alien from the thought of Paul, and has no parallel in any of his writings. When was Paul under God's smile and on the way to eternal life? In the days of infancy, before the age of responsibility. He had then a life which the death of the body could not touch. To have slain the little one at Tarsus would only have put him beyond the reach of sin and death. . . . Yet even in those days Paul was a child born in sin. But he knew not right and wrong. Consequently, the sin which lay in his heart was powerless and inactive. The child grew to boyhood. Through his mother's lips the commandment of God came to him. He learned that God had forbidden him to desire certain objects around. And now awoke to activity the innate but slumbering power of sin. Paul's own depraved nature led him to break the law, and thus made him conscious of the presence and power of sin. His death was the loss of the life he possessed in the days of innocence.\*

\**Commentary on Romans*, p. 205.

Dr. Beet claims that this is the interpretation of Origen, with which Meyer and Godet concur. He thus joins the ancient and the modern interpreters in the support of his exposition. On the other hand, Dr. Shedd says:

It is seeming life antithetic to the seeming death of sin in the preceding verse. The enjoyment of sin and the absence of remorse make up a false and counterfeit life which is the characteristic of the unconverted sinner. . . . The life intended here, in *ξων*, is the same with that expressed in the second member of the epicure's dictum: *dum vivimus, vivamus*, or in the common phrases, "high life" and "seeing life."\*

The word "dead," in the preceding verse, he explains as "unconvicted," "without remorse." "Only a seeming death is meant, like the death of sleep. Compare Shakespeare's 'We were dead of sleep' (*Tempest*, v, i)."

These two widely divergent views, by two of the latest and most eminent commentators, show how arduous a task it is to determine or ascertain the exact meaning of the apostle's phrase.

It is difficult to conceive that Paul should have referred to the period antecedent to responsibility, that is, to his childhood state, without some more definite intimation of it. There is no other instance of such reference on the part of Paul. Besides, it is not a state which results in death to which sin brought him, but a state of death. "Sin revived . . . I died." The same remark will apply to Dr. Shedd's, "seeming death as contrasted with seeming life." The whole transaction is too intensely real to justify these interpretations.

Sin was in Paul's view a terrible reality, from which he had obtained deliverance through Christ; and he here adverts to his former state, when the law revealed to him his sinfulness, and became his school-master to bring him to Christ. Is it not better to affirm that by being "alive" the apostle meant to be without a consciousness of sin—in a state of enjoyment? When he did not understand the true nature of the law he thought himself a keeper of the law. Neither the statement that "his death was the loss of the life he possessed in the days of his innocence," nor that "the life intended here in *ξων* is that expressed in the second member of the epicure's dictum," meets

\* Shedd's *Commentary on Romans*, p. 183.

the requirements of Paul's argument. His life, so far as we know it, was an intensely serious life. "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." He affirms the rectitude of his purposes and his consequent satisfaction with his own course. It was not "a false, counterfeit life;" it was an earnest life, but a mistaken one, actually enjoying its deeds, until the commandment came and awakened him to its real character. He himself says of his condition before conversion: "As touching the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the Church." On the other hand, by being dead, *νεκρά*, he means consciousness of being a sinner, deserving of the penalty due to those who violate the law of God.

With this interpretation in mind we may profitably examine the passage more closely. "I was alive without the law once." When was the once—ποτέ—when was he alive? It was the time when he was *χωρὶς νόμου*. The text does not say, without *the law*—that is, that he had not the law—but apart from the consideration or full comprehension of law, he was alive.

Meyer on Rom. iii, 28, on *χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου*, explains "without the co-operation therein of works of law (ver. 20), which on the contrary remain apart from all connection with it." It does not mean, then, without the possession of law, but without taking law into the account he was alive, but when a clear and full revelation of law came to him he died. Similarly Piele interprets:

For when the pressure of law is not felt, a man's propensity to sin is not felt; it is even, as it were, dead within him. . . . Yea, I once, because I felt not the full significance and constraining power of law, had spiritual life in me, as I thought.

His being alive was not in connection with the ante-legal state, as Beet affirms, but with his condition apart from law. In this state he had a life of which he was deprived by the coming of the law in its fullness. When did this sense of the law fully come to him? Was it not when he was awakened on his way to Damaseus? Then it was that he realized his inability to save himself by law, and surrendered himself to accept the gratuitous salvation provided by Christ. It was when sin deceived him, and through the law slew him, that he cried out for deliverance. The coming of the law into his consciousness was the

coming of death, because it revealed to him sin, which results in spiritual and eternal death.

Another exegetical difficulty has arisen at the fourteenth verse. The former part of the chapter uniformly employs the aorist tense, but at this point the present becomes the tense uniformly employed. How can this change be accounted for? Dr. Whedon's Commentary regards the whole passage (7-25) as a parenthesis, but offers no solution of this change of tense. He regards verses 7-12 as an expansion of verse 5, and verses 13-25 as an expansion of 7-12, and remarks that "it is clear that all three passages do describe but one thing: how with the man in the flesh under the law the motions of sin bring forth death."

Some explanation, however, is clearly needed, and Dr. Shedd says:

St. Paul now turns to the experience of the regenerate. The sudden and striking change in verse 14 and continuing through the entire section, from the past to the present tense together with *ποτέ* in verse 9, indicates this.\*

It is the mark, or at least one of the marks, by which Paul reveals the transition from the condition of the unregenerate to that of the regenerate.

Dr. Beet has also given an explanation, but a very different one. In his commentary on Rom. vii, 14, he says:

Notice the change from the past to the present. In order to explain the purpose of a bygone event, namely, "sin slew me," Paul describes the abiding state of death in which that event placed him. The event of death is past, the state of death is present.

Again he says:

It has been objected to the view here advocated that the change of tense between verses 13 and 14 implies a change of time. But we saw under verse 14 that the past tenses describe the event of death; the present tenses describe the abiding state which followed the event. . . . I account therefore for the grammatical structure of the passage by saying that Paul throws himself into the past and writes as though it were present. . . . The past and present tenses are distinguished not only in time but as different modes of viewing an action. The past tense looks upon it as already complete; the present, as going on before our eyes. He is at liberty, therefore, to use that tense which enables him

\* Shedd's *Commentary on Romans*, *i. c.*

to present most vividly the picture before him. This mode of speech is common to all languages; but it is a conspicuous feature of the language in which this epistle is written. (See Kuehner, Greek Grammar, § 382, 2.) . . . In the narration of past events the present is frequently used, especially in principal sentences, but not infrequently in subordinate sentences, while in the vividness of the presentation the past is looked upon as present.

In other words, at the fourteenth verse, for greater vividness of expression, or to make the language more pictorial, Paul employs the present tense. Dr. Beet, in common with Dr. Whedon, regards the paragraph as continuous and having no break in the subject. Dr. Shedd divides it into two sections, making the break at this point. But just why the *էγώ* remains with a complete change of reference does not clearly appear.

Alford explains:

I believe the true account will be nearly as follows: From verses 7-13, inclusive, is *historical*, and the *էγώ* there is the historical self, under the working of conviction of sin, and showing the work of the law. . . . Then at verse 14 Paul, according to a habit very common to him, keeps hold of the carnal self, and still having it in view, transfers himself into his present position, altering the past tense to the present.

Meyer also regards the paragraph as continuous:

For the subject is in verses 14-25 necessarily the same—and that, indeed, in its unredeemed condition—as previously gave its psychological history prior to and under the law (hence the *preterites* in verses 7-13), and now depicts its position confronting (*δέ*) the pneumatic nature of the law (hence the *presents* in verse 14, *j'*). . . . It is true the situation which the apostle thus exhibits in his own representative ego, was for himself as an individual one long since past; but he realizes it as present, and places it before their eyes like a picture, in which the stand-point of the happier present in which he now finds himself renders possible the perspective that lends to every feature of his portrait the light of clearness and truth.

Will it not be better to assume that the change of tense is due to the transition from an historical fact in his own experience, antecedent to the revelation of the law to him in its fullness, to a statement of a universal experience of all men, then and now, of the antagonism between a spiritual law which can only be fulfilled by a spiritual man, and the natural man. What he states in verses 7-13 is the fact that in his own case the law was a benediction and not an evil; that it revealed to him his

sinfulness; while in verses 14-25 he affirms an antagonism between the spiritual law and the natural man, which belongs to all men, and which is true of all men now, as the former fact was to him in *his* earlier experience.

The change of tense without notice is not infrequent in Paul's writings. His digressions are made without warning to the reader; a slight shade of thought passing through his mind, or the mention of a single word, is enough to set him off into a digression which illuminates the subject under discussion and places it amid larger environments.

Who is meant by the *ἐγώ* running through this section is another of the controverted points to which attention needs to be called. Is it Paul himself, or does he speak in a representative capacity?

Augustine, with others, regards the *ἐγώ* as Paul himself, and this is the most natural meaning to be placed upon the language. Granting that in other places he employs the *ἐγώ* and *ἵμεις* metaphorically, or, in his own language, 1 Cor. iv, 6, *μετεσχημάτισα*, it does not follow that such usage is applicable here. He is writing to the Roman Church, who would not be supposed to know this method of personification of the apostle, and would naturally interpret in a straightforward manner.

Further, it is inconceivable that he would do so in an epistle so important, and in which he was embodying a system of doctrine for the Church in the capital of the civilized world. The fact also that the *ἐγώ* is carried throughout the paragraph, with the employment of the plural but twice, would indicate that he uses it in the ordinary sense. The pertinency also of the illustration would be more clear, and its influence greater on his hearers, if at this point he related his own experience in relation to the value of the law. And yet, as Tholuck observes, we require always to keep in view that Paul compresses individual experiences into general propositions and results.

The reader who takes up this book merely to ascertain its meaning, and looking at this passage as isolated from its connection after the manner already indicated as the initial step in the exposition of a passage, would not hesitate to believe that Paul is here using himself as an illustration of the doctrine he is enforcing; namely, the inability of the law to save the sinner,

and at the same time its excellence in revealing sin and in awakening a sense of sin.

Nor are we justified in accepting the different uses of *ἐγώ* in the passage as claimed by Dr. Shedd.\* He remarks, that in order to correct exegesis it is necessary in the outset to notice two senses in which *ἐγώ* is used in this section by St. Paul:

1. *Comprehensive*; 2. *Limited*. The comprehensive *ἐγώ* denotes the entire person of the believer, as actuated by both the Holy Spirit and the remainders of the evil principle of sin. The *ἐγώ* in this sense is complete, and contains a mixture of both the spiritual and the carnal, in which, however, the *spiritual predominates*. The limited *ἐγώ*, on the other hand, denotes the person of the believer *only as actuated by the Holy Spirit*, omitting and excluding the workings of remaining sin. The instances of this latter signification are only two, namely: *ἐγώ* in verses 17 and 20, qualified by *οὐκέτι*. This limited *ἐγώ* is also described in verse 22 as *ὁ ἐσω ἀνθρώπος*, and in verses 23 and 25 as *ὁ νόμος τοῦ νοός*. The comprehensive *ἐγώ* includes the limited *ἐγώ* *plus* the remnants of the old sinful nature. The limited *ἐγώ* includes only the new principle of holiness *minus* these remnants. The former is a complex of grace and sin; the latter is grace simply and only.

This analysis is exceedingly clear, and is put in the masterly and analytic style for which Dr. Shedd is so justly admired. Of course, if we assume the stand-point of Dr. Shedd, namely, that Paul is describing in verses 14–25 a regenerate man, some such discrimination in the meaning of *ἐγώ* in different parts of this paragraph is necessary; but if, on the other hand, we look at this passage in its parts as we are now doing, the student would scarcely suspect any such subtle discrimination. It is supposable that he would continue to use the *ἐγώ* in the same sense throughout the same discussion.

Looking at this passage in the absence of a theory of interpretation, we reach the conclusion that Paul is here speaking of his own experience at some point in his past life or during some condition of it.

It is important to notice that one of the points made by Dr. Shedd in explanation, if not in proof, of his discrimination between the unlimited and the limited *ἐγώ* is, that the comprehensive *ἐγώ* “contains a mixture of both the spiritual and the carnal, in which, however, *the spiritual predominates*.” At what

\* Shedd's *Commentary on Romans*, p. 191.

point in this chapter does the "spiritual predominate?" This is a question of the utmost importance. It can be answered only by referring to the passage itself. The quotations are from the late Revision: "For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin" (ver. 14); "What I hate, that I do" (ver. 15); "For the good which I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I practise" (ver. 19); "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" Vers. 22-24.

This passage, which Dr. Whedon felicitously calls the battle of the I's, is remarkable for the fact that victory never is with the I of the higher nature, but invariably with the I of the lower nature. It is a conflict between  $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$ , and  $\nu\omega\xi$ , in which the  $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$  is invariably victor. The bearing of the twenty-fifth verse is simply to summarize the nature of the conflict. The conclusion was interrupted by the thanksgiving of the apostle that in his helplessness he had found deliverance in Jesus Christ. One who is conversant with the style of Paul will see in this verse, in its relation to the previous context, a familiar form of Pauline style. He is describing the conflict with all the fervor of recollections which were vivid and fresh; he reaches the point where the helplessness of the natural man becomes overpowering; he cries out for deliverance in one of the most impassioned utterances to be found in any language, and, full of rapturous joy, bursts into thanksgiving for the prospect of deliverance and for the deliverer. It is the mighty sweep of his great soul, stirred to its very depths, that could not stop until rescued from his state of nature and brought into the state of grace. He then stops, and in a single sentence he recalls the conflict and the parties to it. "So then I myself with the mind serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." Ver. 25.

This brings us to a point of practical importance: is it the regenerate man battling with indwelling sin who is here described, or is it the natural man in whom the higher and the lower natures are in conflict? The *I myself*, in the twenty-fifth verse, has the two parts already indicated; namely, the  $\nu\omega\xi$  and the  $\sigma\alpha\rho\xi$ . Do these two parts constitute the natural man or the

spiritual man? We must be careful here in the definition of our terms. If by the natural man it is meant to describe a man who has no spiritual light, no divine voice speaking to him, then it must be conceded that this is a description too high for such a person; but if we bear in mind that this is one to whom the law has spoken, and who has been awakened by the Spirit of God, then we have a description in harmony with human experience in all ages of the Church.

The exact point of discussion, however, is, whether the νοῦς, ἔσω ἀνθρωπος, πνεῦμα, are here identical. Dr. Shedd says, ἔσω ἀνθρωπον is identical with the limited ἐγώ of verses 17 and 20, and δόνυμος τοῦ νοῦς in verse 23, and δόνυμος (put for νόμος τοῦ νοῦς in verse 25). He quotes Pareus: "*Interior homo est novus seu regeneratus, mens illuminata, voluntas renovata,*" with approval. His own statement is most emphatic:

But St. Paul's description of the ἔσω ἀνθρωπος makes it to be a dominant and controlling principle, able to struggle with and triumph over the powerful remnants of corruption (vii, 25). It is not a weak and vacillating aspiration, but a strong and abiding disposition. The ἔσω ἀνθρωπος is the human spirit regenerated and inhabited by the Holy Spirit. It is not the merely human, but the human and divine in synthesis.

It is not the contention of this paper that it is not the "human and divine in synthesis," for the immanence of the divine in human consciousness is nowhere denied, but that the person here described is not the "human spirit regenerate." It is not a man who is "without God in the world," but one to whom God has come in enlightening and awakening power, but not in regenerating power.

It is to be noted, first of all, that the word spiritual or spirit does not occur between the fourteenth verse of the seventh chapter and the second verse of the eighth chapter. In chapter vii, verse 14, we read: "We knew that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin." Hodge and Meyer define πνευματικός as being "the expression of the Holy Spirit, the absolute πνεῦμα." This is more than the mere statement that the law is the embodiment of the Holy Spirit, and is fulfilled, as Tholuck states, "only by those who are actuated by the Holy Spirit." In other words, it is the statement that the spiritual man only can be in harmony with the spiritual law. If

he is not spiritual, if he has not become a new creature, by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, there must be a constant antagonism between him and this spiritual law. That the man here described is not in harmony, but in a state of antagonism, is shown by the statement, "But I am carnal, sold under sin." It seems strange that one should say that the "word πεπράμενος, like σάρκινός, is used relatively." Certainly the figure of slavery is the strongest conceivable. If Paul had deliberately undertaken to build a phrase which should express a state of bondage most completely, he could not have framed one more expressive than that which he here employs. "It recalls the slave market and the master, whose property Paul now legally is."

The remaining description clearly shows a man in whom the σάρξ predominates. Moreover, the absence of πνεῦμα, and the substitution of νοῦς and ἐσω ἀνθρωπος, show the nature of the conflict as one which takes place in the man whom Paul describes in the beginning of the contest as "carnal." The ἐσω ἀνθρωπος determines nothing in itself as to its precise import in any particular place. It is merely the inner as opposed to the outer, and is to be explained according to the person under consideration. It may mean the mental as opposed to the physical, in a regenerate or in an unregenerate man. The most recent New Testament lexicon (Thayer) defines δ ἐσω ἀνθρωπος "the internal, inner man, that is, the soul, conscience."

In 2 Cor. iv, 16, there is a direct contrast between the outer man and the inner man, the former referring to the corporeal, the latter to the intellectual. The meaning, a renewed man, cannot be drawn from the language itself, but must be gained, if at all, from its setting in the sentence. What it means will further appear from the word which in the passage represents it, namely, νοῦς. Thayer's Lexicon defines this word as follows:

1. The mind, comprising alike the faculties of perceiving and understanding and those of feeling, judging, determining; hence,  
*a)* the intellectual faculty, the understanding, opposed to τὸ πνεῦμα, the spirit intensely roused and completely absorbed with divine things, but destitute of clear ideas of them; . . . *b)* reason in the narrower sense, as the capacity for spiritual truth, the higher powers of the soul, the faculty of perceiving divine things, of recognizing goodness and of hating evil.

These are the chief meanings assigned to the word, and it will be seen that none of them include the element of regeneration. There is such a thing as the renewal of the mind, ἡ ἀνακαίνωσις τοῦ νοός (Rom. xii, 2), but this renewal is the work of the Holy Spirit, which constitutes the essence of the new nature. In Eph. iv, 23, the apostle exhorts to “be renewed in the spirit of your mind,” which Thayer\* expounds “to be so changed that the spirit which governs the mind is renewed.” It is clear that without some words to qualify it, and show that it means a regenerate man, it cannot be so employed without violence to the ordinary usage of the word.

If further proof were needed that this paragraph does not refer to the regenerate Paul, but to Paul under law—convicted, enlightened, but not saved—it will be found by recurring to the point in the apostle’s argument where this discussion begins, namely, at the sixth verse of this chapter: “So that we serve in newness of the spirit, and not in oldness of the letter:” ὅστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος.

What are we to understand by *καινότητι πνεύματος*, and also by *παλαιότητι γράμματος*?

It weakens the force of the expressions very much to say, that *πνεῦμα* here is the “human spirit, enlightened, enlivened, and actuated by the divine; a new spirit in man compared with the previous one.”†

The contrast here does not seem to be between the new spirit and the old letter, but between the new man—the new creature, animated by the Holy Spirit—and the old man, the unregenerate man, dominated by the law. The absence of the article with *πνεύματος* and *γνάμματος* does not conflict with this view, for it marks that while each is spoken of in its individual character, their qualitative aspect floats before the mind of the apostle. In the first part of the verse, having stated that we are free from the law as a basis of justification, the apostle concludes with the result of the freedom; namely, a service which proceeds from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and not a service under the dominance of the mere letter of the law. Then the *πνεῦμα* drops out of the discussion, until it reappears in the eighth chapter, as expressive of the characteristic mark of

\* Lexicon, on *νοῦς*.

† Shedd.

a regenerate man : " There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death." It is apparent, then, that *νοῦς* and *ἔσω ἀνθρώπος* do not equal *πνεῦμα*, but the condition of Paul antecedent to the entrance of the *πνεῦμα* into his heart. If the phrase *sold under sin* is to be taken in its full sense, and not "relatively" (the latter—*Shedd*), what shall be the interpretation of the twenty-second verse, " I delight in the law of God after the inward man," *συνήδομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἀνθρώπον ?*

Perhaps there are few passages of Scripture where subjective considerations have apparently had more to do with interpretation than in the fourteenth and the twenty-third verses of this chapter. Augustine is said to have held the view of the early Greek commentators until, in a controversy, he came to the conclusion that *συνήδομαι* represented too high a state for the unregenerate man. Dr. Whedon, who gives full force to "sold under sin," seems to weaken the force of this word. On the other hand, Dr. Shedd, who says *πεπραμένος ὑπὸ ἀμαρτίας* is used relatively, affirms of *συνήδομαι*, " It denotes a feeling of the heart, positive enjoyment." He quotes as authority Plato's *Republic*, which says : " When any one of the citizens experiences any good or evil, the whole State will make his ease their own, and either rejoice (*ξυνηθύσεται*) or sorrow with him." Beet translates : " I am pleased together with the law," that is, " what pleases the law pleases me." He adds : " The rendering, ' I delight in the law,' is less agreeable to the form of this not uncommon Greek word, and is supported only by one or two passages in the poets." The passage from Plato's *Republic*, quoted above, is a prose passage, and in contrast with "sorrow," gives a strong sense of delight to this word. But why not let it have its full sense ? Assuming, as is generally done, that the *ἐγὼ* is Paul himself, what objection to the statement that even in his unregenerate state he delighted in the law of God ? The law had encompassed him from his childhood. It had been the study of his life ; his zeal for it had never died. It is true, before his conversion he did not see the depth of its meaning, but it was the law of his God and of his people, nevertheless. The inward man, though, even before regeneration, delighted in that law. It was probable that there was

never an hour in his history when he would not have said with the psalmist, "Thy law is my delight;" "The law of thy mouth is more precious to me than thousands of gold and of silver." Instead of being surprised that Paul used this expression of himself at that time, would it not be more surprising if he had used any weaker words to express his regard for the law, which had not only been his inheritance, but the subject of his meditations for so many years?

But if we go further, and regard Paul as representing here not only himself, but the non-Jewish world, there need be no modification of the full meaning of the language. If by the natural man we mean the natural man to whom the law has come with its grandeur and perfection; if we assume only the law written in the heart of the pagan, and the enlightenment which God does not withhold from those who desire the truth, it may still be affirmed, without predicing "of the character of the natural man what the Church dogma decidedly denies to it."

That the pagan world did have some lofty conceptions of a similar conflict to the one represented in this paragraph is shown by quotations made by Dr. Beet, whose views have been already frequently mentioned:

It has been objected that the language of the section is inapplicable to men not yet justified. But we find similar language on the lips of Greek and Roman pagans. Compare Seneca's Letters, 52: "What is it that draws us in one direction while striving to go in another, and impels us toward that which we wish to avoid?" . . . Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, vi, 1, 41: "I have evidently two souls, . . . for if I have only one it would not be at the same time good and bad; nor would it desire at the same time both honorable and dishonorable works; nor would it at the same time both wish and not wish to do the same things. But it is evident that there are two souls, and that when the good one is in power the honorable things are practiced, but when the bad, the dishonorable things are attempted." . . . Euripides, *Medea*, 1078: "I know what sort of bad things I am going to do, but passion is stronger than my purposes. And this is to mortals a cause of great evils." I do not say that these passages teach the great truth to prove which Paul quotes his own experience. Nor do they mention the law of God. But they prove that in many cases men are carried along against their better judgment to do bad things. . . . And these passages also prove that even in pagans there is an inward man which approves what God's law approves.

If we consult the experiences of Christian men before conversion, we will find many who, even in their sinful state, could say, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man." The awakening of the conscience shows also the beauty of the divine law. There are things, beautiful things, whose contemplation gives delight, but to which we either do not care to come or cannot come. In fact, it is one of the deepest proofs of our depravity that when we see the law, the good, even when we desire it, we do not or cannot grasp it and keep it. How terrible the condition of one dying of thirst with water within reach, who is so under bondage that he will not and cannot stretch forth his hand to take it! The whole trend of thought of the Epistle to the Romans is not to show that men do not know the good or desire it, but that, appreciating the good, and even desiring it, they do not perform it, and are helpless to save themselves from their condition. Who more likely to cry out, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?" than he who is in the condition above described? It is the cry of a helpless soul, and is followed by a thanksgiving for deliverance wrought by Jesus Christ. Paul represents the whole creation as groaning for deliverance, and this groaning God has heard.

The characteristic of the new man is the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, and this new creation of God in the human soul, and giving the victory, is brought to view in the beginning of the eighth chapter. In this chapter we pass to a new stage of man's history, and that stage is marked by the introduction of the key-word of the Christian religion and of the Christian life—the Holy Spirit.

It has thus been attempted to set forth some of the points of divergence in the interpretation of this profound study of the great apostle, but not in any formal way to harmonize theological theories. And yet they have a most important bearing upon great doctrines and experiences of the Christian life. At another time the doctrinal bearings of this chapter and of its interpretations may be considered.

HENRY A. BUTTZ.

## ART. III.—CHURCH UNION AND ANGLICAN ORDINATION.

THE question of Church Unity, and of the fraternal union of the various Protestant denominations, has recently been brought once more into great prominence, and has attracted very general attention. The renewed interest in this subject is due very largely to agitation within the Anglican bodies, both on this and on the other side of the sea.

In the Church of England the desire for union has taken two forms, which are closely akin but have some difference. On the part of some connected with the Establishment, there has been a strong desire to have the dissenting bodies give up their organizations and blend with the national Church; on the part of others, there has been an earnest desire for the disappearance of the differences which not only keep the bodies apart, but which are also the occasion of considerable antagonism. The former class would absorb the Dissenters; the latter would like at least a greater degree of fraternity.

Dr. Campbell, Archbishop of Canterbury, in an address delivered in 1872 to the rural deaneries of North and South Malling, said :

I think we shall fail of our duty if we confine our regard to the Episcopal Churches, and are not anxious to give the hand of brotherhood to others also with whom we are intimately connected in the bonds of a common faith.\*

Again, the Archbishop said in the same address :

No doubt, also, it is a grave and important subject for us to consider, that while men are holding out the right hand of fellowship to the Episcopal Churches of the Continent, there are so many of our own brethren at home from whom we are estranged. Every effort which can be made to unite us more truly in the bonds of Christian love with these our brethren at home seems to come to us recommended by something more practical than is found in efforts to unite with foreigners, many of whom show little inclination to admit us to their fellowship, and some of whom could not admit us without our denying the great principles of our Reformed Church. †

\* *Present Position of the Church of England*, London, 1872, pp. 90, 91.

† *Present Position of the Church of England*, pp. 91, 92.

That the Primate meant something different from absorption or organic unity may be inferred from the remarks immediately following those just quoted, when he says :

I am no visionary, looking forward to a time when all the various denominations throughout Britain are to come and desire admission into the Church of England; but still I think if we persevere in the loving, faithful discharge of our duty—if we adhere faithfully to the formularies which we have received from the time of the Reformation, and if we show in all things where we can without any compromise of principle a hearty spirit of Christian love—there is every hope that in Christ's good time the differences that keep us apart may disappear.\*

In this country similar feelings pervade the Protestant Episcopal Church. This fact was manifest by various discussions prior to the meeting of the General Convention of that body last year, and by various deliverances during its deliberations.

The boldest effort was made by Dr. Phillips Brooks, of Boston, who offered a resolution stating "that the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church sends cordial greetings to the Assembly of the Congregational Church." This called forth both support and opposition; but the majority seemed hardly ready to acknowledge the Congregational body to be a Church. The result was, that a resolution declaring "that we send our cordial greetings to our Congregational brethren," was substituted. This recognized them as individual Christians, and hence brethren, but did not acknowledge their body to be a Church; and the substitution of "brethren" for "Church" was regarded as very significant.

In this form the resolution passed to the House of Bishops for concurrence. This was on Wednesday, October 13, 1886. On Friday, the 15th, the Bishops sent the following message to the deputies in response to the above resolution :

The House of Bishops respectfully informs the House of Deputies that having, from the first day of its session, had before it the momentous subject of Christian unity, and the reunion of Christendom, it takes the opportunity presented by the action of the House of Deputies (communicated in Message No. 12) to assure that House of its profound sympathy with the spirit of these resolutions. This House declares its hearty respect and affection for all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and at this time, especially, for their fellow-Christians assembled in

\* *Present Position of the Church of England*, p. 92.

this city as the "National Council of Congregational Churches in the United States." This House also avows its solemn purpose, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to promote, with the concurrence of the House of Deputies, some practical plan for bringing before all our fellow-Christians in this land the duty to our common Lord and Saviour of terminating the unhappy divisions which dishonor his blessed name, and hinder the triumph upon earth of his glorious kingdom.

*Resolved*, That Message No. 12, from the House of Deputies, be respectfully returned to that House with the above statement of the reasons for the failure of the House of Bishops to approve the resolution contained in said message.

So far there was nothing final, though there was enough of the conservative spirit in it to develop the fear that the matter would end in what has been termed "hazy compromise." It was noticeable that the bishops appeared to avoid any recognition of the Congregational body as a Church, and only used the word "Churches" in quoting the legal title of the "National Council of Congregational Churches in the United States." As it was a quotation, they escaped committing themselves on the point as to whether the Congregational body was a Church, whereas Dr. Phillips Brooks's resolution took the responsibility of a recognition, and mentioned "the Congregational Church."

On the 20th of October, the very day the Committee on the State of the Church presented majority and minority reports on the question of the unity of Christians, the House of Bishops sent a message on the same subject to the House of Deputies, in response to various memorials. The declaration of the Bishops is as follows:

We do hereby solemnly declare to all whom it may concern, and especially to our fellow-Christians of the different communions in this land, who in their several spheres have contended for the religion of Christ:

1. Our earnest desire is, that the Saviour's prayer, "that we all may be one," may, in its deepest and truest sense, be speedily fulfilled.
2. That we believe that all who have been duly baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost are members of the Holy Catholic Church.
3. That in all things of human ordering or human choice relating to modes of worship and discipline, or to traditional customs, this Church is ready, in the spirit of love and humility, to forego all preferences of her own.

4. That this Church does not seek to absorb other communions, but, rather, co-operating with them on the basis of a common faith and order, to discontinue schism, to heal the wounds of the body of Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world. But, furthermore, we do hereby affirm that the Christian unity so earnestly desired by the memorialists can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first age of its existence, which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and his apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal good of all men. As inherent parts of this sacred deposit, and therefore as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom, we account the following—to wit :

1.) The Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testament, as the revealed word of God.

2.) The Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

3.) The two sacraments—baptism and the supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by him.

4.) The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and people called of God into the unity of his Church.

Furthermore, deeply grieved by the said divisions which afflict the Christian Church in our land, we hereby declare our desire and readiness, so soon as there shall be any authorized response to this declaration, to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the Church, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass.

This very cautiously worded communication “to all whom it may concern,” has been regarded as a great advance on the part of the Protestant Episcopal bishops, and as lifting the Protestant Episcopal Church “to a higher plane of Catholic charity than it has ever occupied before;” but it will be observed that “all whom it may concern” are not referred to as Christian Churches, but as “different communions,” “other communions,” “Christian communions,” and “Christian bodies,” while the Protestant Episcopal Church is referred to as “this Church.” Thus it starts out with what many will claim to be a tacit denial that the other “Christian bodies” are Christian Churches,

which at first sight is not calculated to commend it to bodies which have been calling themselves Churches, some even for centuries.

Then the efforts in the House of Deputies to change the name of the Protestant Episcopal Church by striking out Protestant Episcopal and calling it "The Church," "The Church in the United States of America," or "The American Catholic Church," are calculated to have the same repellent effect. It is true that these efforts did not succeed, but, nevertheless, the close and growing vote in their favor tends to put other Churches on the defensive.

Such facts as these have caused many denominations to look with not a little suspicion on proposals of union from the Anglican Church. It has been felt by many that the proposals were akin to the invitation of the spider to the fly, and that the resultant union would be after the fashion of the lion and the lamb lying down together, with the lamb inside the lion. If this is what the proposed unity means, then it will not be attractive to many, for all living bodies naturally shrink from absorption and annihilation.

But the declaration of the Protestant Episcopal bishops says:

This Church does not seek to absorb other communions, but, rather, co-operating with them on the basis of a common faith and order, to discontinue schism, to heal the wounds of the body of Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world.

This seems plain enough and fair enough; but the concluding part of the bishops' communication uses expressions which appear to throw this clear statement into confusion, and raise the question whether there is not a little contradiction. In the concluding paragraph reference is made to "the sad divisions which afflict the Christian Church in our land," and "desire and readiness" are expressed "to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the Church."

Here the objective point is "organic unity," and thus the project becomes somewhat indefinite. Co-operation is one thing, organic unity is another. In one place the thing said to be sought is co-operation, but in another place the thing

pointed out is organic unity. If there is organic unity then there cannot be co-operation, for co-operation implies different bodies, while organic unity implies only one. If organic union takes place then there will be absorption, or, at least, combination and assimilation. The bishops' declaration, however, is that the Protestant Episcopal "Church does not seek to absorb other communions." But without something in the nature of absorption there cannot be organic unity. Now, if the Protestant Episcopal Church does not seek to "absorb other communions," does the declaration mean that the other "Christian bodies" shall absorb it? This it will hardly permit, if it hold that the others are not Churches, and that it is "the Church." If, then, it will not absorb others and will not let others absorb it, how can the "organic unity" be brought about? Certainly there is some confusion of terms, if not confusion of intention. The proposal of the House of Bishops, however, should be received in a spirit of fairness and fraternity, and should be examined with care and intelligence, for it is to be assumed that it springs from a good motive.

Naturally, the first question which will arise among the bodies invited to consider the propriety of entering this new relation will be, What does it mean? Is it union in the sense of co-operation, or is it organic unity in the sense of absorption and consequent annihilation of the old organism? Is the one side to give up every thing and deny its past, while the other side takes every thing and gives up nothing? Does it mean that Lutherans, Baptists, Presbyterians, and all the others are to become Protestant Episcopalian?

These questions will be asked, for it is important to know precisely what is intended. If it means organic unity in the sense that there will be only one ecclesiastical organization, then there is no probability that it ever will take place. It is not likely, for example, that the great Presbyterian bodies will ever consent to be merged into the Protestant Episcopal.

But, even if organic unity could be brought about, it is a question whether the resultant evil would not be greater than the good, no matter what polity might be adopted. History tells us that the days of the greatest ecclesiastical unity in the Christian Church were the darkest and most corrupt, and that greater purity came with the ecclesiastical divisions following

the great Lutheran protest against the corrupt centralization of the Roman Church.

Professor George R. Crooks, D.D., LL.D., in the *Century* for December, 1886, well says that "the trouble we had to get clear of Rome ought to be a reminder to us Protestants that a concentrated ecclesiastical unity is sure to be a concentrated ecclesiastical tyranny."

Divisions on principle tend to the preservation of purity in doctrine and freedom in government, and, at the same time, the different bodies in their common struggle stimulate each other to sustained activity and provoke one another unto good works. The different Protestant bodies will not require much time to decide against organic unity in one ecclesiastical organization; but fraternal union, where common equality is acknowledged and fraternal co-operation is practiced, is a very different thing from organic unity. It has all the good of unity without its evil; and in it there is no necessary humiliation for any denomination, for then each body, agreeing on fundamentals, may agree to disagree on non-essentials, and so each continue to preserve its cherished peculiarities.

Now, if this fraternal union and brotherly co-operation be what is meant when the Protestant Episcopal bishops say their "Church does not seek to absorb other communions, but, rather, co-operating with them on the basis of a common faith and order to," etc., then there will be a hearty fraternal response on the part of the other Christian Churches constituting our common Protestantism. But if this common desire for mutual recognition and co-operation exists, why does not the recognition and union exist as an accomplished fact? Every Protestant Church, we may say, is willing to recognize the Protestant Episcopal and the Church of England as true Christian Churches. Then, if both are desirous of recognizing each other, why does not the mutual recognition take place at once, without any further waste of time? We may go a step further, and affirm that all, or almost all, the other Protestant Churches do recognize the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Churches as true Churches. Yet the fraternal union between such bodies does not exist.

What is the matter? Why does not the fraternal feeling fully manifest itself? The fault does not appear, generally

speaking, to be on the side of the "other communions." In every case, or almost every case, they will accept Protestant Episcopal ministers on their ministerial standing in that body, and their members on their good standing in that communion; but there is no reciprocity on the other side. The Protestant Episcopal Church practically denies the ministerial standing of the minister who comes to it from another Protestant Church, and practically denies the church-membership of the Christian who comes to it from another Protestant Church, for it insists upon re-ordinating the minister and upon confirming the member.

This is the situation. One side recognizes the other, the other side does not recognize it. All that is needed, then, is for the one which holds aloof to make a similar recognition.

The difficulty seems to be with the Protestant Episcopal Church; for while some in that body seem willing to recognize the other Churches, others make the desired consummation more difficult by trying to make their body an non-Protestant Church, and, calling it "The Church," practically say, "We are the Church and have the true ministry, and the other communions are not Churches and have not a valid ministry." Certainly such wooing is not very winning, and not calculated to draw the different bodies together in harmonious co operation.

In the conditions just suggested lies the real difficulty raised by the Anglican bodies against recognizing the other Protestant Reformed Churches. It is in the matter of the episcopacy and clerical orders. They claim the necessity of episcopal ordination, and of episcopal ordination by bishops in lineal succession from the apostles; and further, that these bishops are of a higher clerical order than the presbyters, and that presbyters have no right to ordain.

The bishops, in their communication, present, as the last point "essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom," "the historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and people called of God into the unity of his Church." This may mean much or little according to the interpretation put upon it, but it appears to carry with it the idea of ordination by bishops as contradistinguished from presbyters.

Some kindly disposed persons of the Protestant Episcopal

Church have proposed as a way out of the difficulty that all the ministers of other Protestant bodies shall come to the Protestant Episcopal bishops for ordination. But suppose they did so, and then kept on with their Presbyterial and Congregational polities, how much different would the situation be?

As far as the simple historic fact goes, most of these denominations, at their start, received their ordination from bishops or from those who had received episcopal ordination, and they were no better or worse for that. So for the ministers of the present to submit to such ordination would not really change the present condition of things, unless they would go further, and establish episcopal government with bishops consecrated by Church of England or Protestant Episcopal bishops. Even if they did that there would not be true "organic unity," for still they would have separate organizations.

Another way would be for all the ministers of the other bodies, as they came up through the generations, to go to such bishops for ordination. But this would not give "organic unity," and this would be an admission of superiority which probably no Church would consent to make. It would be a confession by the others that they had not a true ministry and were not true Churches. For their clergy to go to the Protestant Episcopal bishops for ordination would be saying, practically, that they were without valid orders, and would be a concession to the "grace of orders" and the spirit of sacerdotalism which these Churches are not likely to make, and which they could not make without casting a painful reflection upon a record which in many instances is most glorious. Such a system of mortification is hardly calculated to bring about the desired union.

As to the proposal that the other denominations shall accept the "historic episcopate," there will be little difficulty if each body is permitted to determine for itself what is the "historic episcopate." The Presbyterians and the Congregationalists say their pastors are bishops, and that theirs is the "historic episcopate" of New Testament times; and the Methodist Episcopalian say their presbyter-superintendents are bishops, and that they have the "historic episcopate" of the primitive Christian Church, adapted to present needs. It is not likely that any of these Churches will yield this point, though, no

doubt, they will be willing to admit that the *episcopoi* of the Anglican communions are real bishops.

We may here ask whether this barrier of episcopal government and episcopal ordination always existed, and whether it can be removed. Besides this we may put another question; namely, whether there are not already existing in the Anglican bodies the elements on which the proposed fraternal union may be based without causing humiliation to them or others.

A study of the points involved will carry us back to the time of the Protestant Reformation. The Protestants on the continent, though springing from an episcopal Church, abandoned the episcopal organization, for the simple reason that the episcopacy sided with the papacy. In England, on the contrary, Protestantism continued to be episcopal because the episcopacy was in harmony with King Henry VIII. in his opposition to the pope. Thus it happened that Continental Protestantism became presbyterian and English Protestantism remained episcopal. A double question now arises: first, How did the English Church regard its episcopacy? and, second, What relation existed between the English Church and the Protestant Reformed Churches on the continent?

In 1537, shortly after the separation of the Anglican Church from Rome, there was published by the authority of the king the *Institution of a Christian Man*, which teaches the parity of bishops and presbyters as to clerical orders. Bishop Burnet remarks:

Both in this writing and in the *Necessary Erudition of a Christian Man*, bishops and priests are spoken of as one and the same office. In the ancient Church they knew none of those subtleties which were found out in the latter ages.\*

In 1540, in answer to questions submitted by the king to the bishops and learned divines, Archbishop Cranmer replied that "the bishops and priests at one time were not two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion;" and the Archbishop of York said, "the name of a bishop is not properly a name of order, but a name of office, signifying an overseer."†

These answers represented the views of the English Reform-

\* Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, Addenda to Part I.

† Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, Records xxv, answer to tenth question.

ers. They held that there were only two clerical orders—namely, priests and deacons; and that bishops and priests were not different orders, but the same, the name bishop not indicating an order but an office. Holding this, they could not logically deny the legality of presbyterian ordination. The facts show that in practice they admitted the validity of presbyterian orders, and that they saw nothing in their episcopal organization to prevent the closest fraternal relations with the Protestant Reformed Churches on the Continent which had only presbyterian ordination.

Dr. Campbell, Archbishop of Canterbury, in one of his addresses "at his primary visitation" in 1872, admitted this close relationship. He said :

Every one knows that we of the Church of England, in the early times of our history, after the Reformation, were much more connected with the non-episcopal than with the episcopal communions.\*

This admission of England's primate is worthy of the careful consideration of the Anglican bodies at the present time, for, if such fraternal relations with non-episcopal Churches existed in the early times, there should be no insuperable obstacle in the way of the resumption of such relations in these later times.

The intimate character of the fraternal relations existing between the Anglican Episcopal Church and the Continental Presbyterian Churches appears from many facts, a few of which may be recited.

Henry VIII. sent two invitations urging Melanchthon to visit England, and it appears that, subsequently, Melanchthon was offered the chair of divinity at Cambridge. Thomas Cromwell wanted to bring about an alliance of all Protestantism, and Cranmer tried to secure a council "of wise and godly men" to compare their opinions, and to come to some agreement, and for this purpose he invited Melanchthon, Calvin, and Bullinger. He also invited many continental Reformers to come to England and assist in the English Reformation. Among those who came were Martyr the Florentine, and Bucer the Reformed minister of Strasburg. Martyr was made a canon, and given the professorship of divinity at Oxford, and Bucer was made divinity professor at Cambridge. Both of these

\* *Present Position of the Church of England*, p. 90.

learned men were in England before the first prayer-book of Edward VI. was issued, and in making the English Prayer-Book the liturgies of the foreign Reformed Churches were used. Both Martyr and Bucer were called in to assist in the revision which resulted in the Second Prayer-Book.

The articles drawn up in Edward's time were forty-two in number, and in this work Peter Martyr had an important part, as he had also in the Second Book of Common Prayer. As a basis for action by the commission, Cranmer submitted thirteen articles, made up chiefly from the Augsburg Confession. In this fact there was a tacit recognition of a continental Church; and the English Reformers at this time did not hesitate to refer to the non-episcopal Protestant bodies on the continent as Churches. The articles which were adopted were based upon the Augsburg Confession, just as the English Prayer-Book was based upon the liturgies of the continental Reformed Churches.

There is nothing in the forty-two articles which would unchurch any non-episcopal Church, or deny its validity; but, on the contrary, it is evident from the circumstances, from the phraseology, and from the testimony of history that they were expressly intended to acknowledge the Protestant Reformed Churches which were not episcopal.

We turn to the forty-two articles to see if there is any thing that declares the invalidity of non-episcopal Churches. The twentieth article (now the nineteenth) says:

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

In this definition of a Christian Church there is no proclamation or suggestion of episcopal government as a requisite, or, indeed, of the necessity of any particular form of polity, but its very wording leads to the inference that, though forms vary, there might be in all the true visible Church. Its definition of "the visible Church of Christ" is, "congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered." Even in regard to preaching and the administration of the sacraments it seems to suggest that there may be differences, for all that is required is, that these shall be done "in all those things that of *necessity* are

requisite to the same ;" but it does not presume to declare in detail what things are necessary. There is, therefore, nothing in this article that would prevent the recognition of any Protestant body, be it Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Congregational ; and, from the relations existing between the English Reformers and the continental Reformers, the legitimate inference is, that this article was so constructed for the express purpose of covering the other Protestant Reformed Churches. The twenty-fourth article (now the twenty-third), defining the true ministry, says :

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

There is not a single word in this article declaring the necessity of apostolic succession through bishops or others, or of ordination by bishops as distinct from presbyters, or of the necessity of three ministerial orders.

Whatever the Church of England preferred for itself, when it came to define a valid ministry it did not specify how many ministerial orders there should be, or by what particular form or method the minister should be set apart for his work. The article merely declares that a minister is one who is " lawfully called " to the work of " preaching, or ministering the sacraments," and that those are " lawfully called and sent," " which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." This is so broad that it recognizes those called and set apart according to the law and form of any Church, or, where the Church is Congregational, by the independent congregation ; and the article distinctly says, in the phrase " we ought," that the Church of England " ought to judge " such persons as " lawfully called and sent," or, in other words, as legitimate Christian ministers. Indeed, it was the evident intention of the makers of this article to recognize the ministry of those Protestant Reformed Churches who were without episcopal government. So Bishop Burnet says :

The general words in which this part of the article is framed seem to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them.\*

That it was intended to recognize diversities of government and usage in the true Church may be inferred from the thirty-third article (now the thirty-fourth). It says:

It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word.

So that though the Book of Common Prayer and the various rites and ceremonies of the Anglican Church were "by all faithful members of the Church of England, but chiefly of the ministers of the word, with all thankfulness and readiness of mind, to be received, approved, and commended to the people of God," (art. xxxv of the forty-two articles), yet there is not the slightest disposition manifested to expect them to be received by other Churches, or the faintest intimation that Churches not conforming to them are not true Churches; but, on the contrary, that a Christian body may be a true Church though differing in "traditions and ceremonies," and Bishop Burnet, commenting on the articles, declares "that not only those who penned the articles, but the body of this Church for above half an age after, did, notwithstanding these irregularities, acknowledge the foreign Churches so constituted to be true Churches as to all the essentials of a Church, though they had been irregularly formed and continued still to be in an imperfect state."†

Not only was episcopal government not considered absolutely essential to the existence of a true church, but ministers who had only presbyterial ordination were received into the ministry of the Church of England without re-ordination, and thus was practically recognized the validity of ordination by presbyters.

Keble, High-Churchman though he was, admits in his preface to Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* (issued about the end of the sixteenth century), that

nearly up to the time when Hooker wrote, numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England with no bet-

\* Burnet on the Articles. See on Art. xxiii.

† Burnet on the XXXIX Articles. See on Art. xxiii.

ter than presbyterian ordination ; and it appears . . . that such was the construction not uncommonly put upon the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth, permitting those who had received orders in any other form than that of the English Service Book, on giving certain securities, to exercise their calling in England.

Dr. Blakeney declares that

in fact, no one of the Church of England in those days thought of calling into question the validity of the orders and sacraments of the Reformed Churches.\*

The fifty-fifth canon of 1604 commands that the Anglican clergy should pray for the Church of Scotland, which then was, as it is now, Presbyterian, thus recognizing a Presbyterian body to be a true Church. It is not a little remarkable that the very year this canon was made Laud was reproved by the University of Oxford for maintaining, in his exercise for Bachelor of Divinity, "that there could be no true Church without bishops"; and one ground of the rebuke was, that it "was thought to cast a bone of contention between the Church of England and the Reformed [churches] on the Continent." This was the beginning of the high-church movement. That it afterward prevailed only shows how heresy may at last be classed as orthodoxy, and reveals the importance of steadily guarding against such evils. It was not, however, until 1661, after the restoration of Charles II., that the words "or hath had episcopal consecration or ordination," were added to the Preface to the Ordination Service, so as to make that necessary for one to be a lawful minister in the Church of England ; but even this was not intended to deny the validity of other Protestant Churches, for the very next section recognizes "the foreign Reformed Churches." There is some reason for supposing that it did not totally prevent ministers from abroad, with presbyterian ordination, from entering the ministry of the English Church without re-ordination ; but, at least, it is plain that up to this time, as Bishop Burnet says, "those who came to England from the foreign Churches had not been required to be ordained among us;" † and Bishop Fleetwood, referring to

\* *Book of Common Prayer in its History and Interpretation.* By the Rev. R. P. Blakeney, D.D., LL.D., Incumbent of Christ Church, Cloughton. Third ed., London, 1870, p. 630.

† Burnet's *History of his Own Times*, vol. i, p. 183.

the Anglican Church, said this was certainly her practice during the reigns of King James and King Charles I. and to the year 1661. "We had many ministers from Scotland, from France, and from the Low Countries, who were ordained by presbyters only, and not bishops, and they were instituted into benefices with cure, . . . and yet were never re-ordained, but only subscribed the articles." \*

These facts will be sufficient for our purpose. If the Church of England wants a fraternal union with other Protestant bodies, the short way out of the difficulty is for the Anglican body to go back to the old principles and the old practice which governed the "Protestant Reformed" Church of England from the Reformation down to the Restoration. Here is an honorable basis upon which the Anglican Church can act without any humiliation on its part. All it has to do is to put itself in harmony with the teaching of its present articles and with its good old practice of recognizing the validity of non-episcopal Protestant churches. Then no Church need give up any peculiarity in its polity, and, despite minor differences, there may be honorable recognition and the truest and most intimate union.

On the part of the Protestant Episcopal Church the way is much easier, for it is not trammelled with the regulations of a State Church. Her articles of religion give precisely the same definition of a true Church and ministry as do those of the Church of England, and so she may fall back on these articles and recognize every orthodox Protestant Church. As the article on the Church does not even suggest the necessity of episcopal government, the Protestant Episcopal Church may recognize as Churches those bodies which have a non-episcopal polity; and, as the article on the ministry does not declare the necessity of episcopal ordination, this Church can recognize as true ministers those who have not been episcopally ordained, but have been chosen and sent according to the laws and usages of the Churches to which they belong. Again, the Protestant Episcopal Church may find authority in the article on the "Traditions of the Church," which declares that "it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one and utterly alike," to recognize other Churches, which, following

\* Fleetwood's Works, p. 552, *Judgment of Church of England in case of Lay Baptism*, 1712.

this law of liberty, have changed human rites and ceremonies according to their judgment of their own peculiar needs.

The Protestant Episcopal Church may also fall back upon the declaration in the Preface to the Prayer-Book, which was ratified October 16, 1789. This preface contains a recognition of the other Churches and of the right of difference in ecclesiastical polity. It says :

When in the course of divine Providence, these American States became independent with respect to civil government, their ecclesiastical independence was necessarily included ; and the *different religious denominations* of Christians in these States were left at full and equal liberty to model and organize their *respective Churches*, and forms of worship, and discipline, in such manner as they might judge most convenient for their future prosperity; consistently with the constitution and laws of their country.

Here, then, in maintaining their own right to organize, the fathers of the Protestant Episcopal Church declare the equal right of "the different religious denominations" to do the same, and speak of the other denominations as "Churches." If they were Churches then, they are Churches now; and, as that preface recognized them then, it may be claimed that it recognizes them as Churches now.

The dogma of apostolic succession may, in the minds of some, seem an insuperable difficulty, but such persons should inquire whether the Church, as such, really holds the dogma.

Dr. Phillips Brooks, in his sermon delivered immediately following the General Convention of 1886, boldly denies that apostolic succession, as commonly understood, is a doctrine of his Church. His words are :

There is no line in our Prayer-Book, there is not a word in any of our formularies, which declares any such theory.

The Rev. Robert A. Edwards, a Protestant Episcopal clergyman of Philadelphia, referring in a sermon to the same matter, says :

The "historic episcopate" of which the Bishops speak neither implies nor involves the holding to the doctrine of apostolic succession as commonly taught, and which would unchurch all who have not received episcopal ordination.

*The Standard of the Cross*, a Protestant Episcopal paper of Cleveland, referring to the recent reply of the Connecticut

Congregational Conference to the deliverance of the Protestant Episcopal bishops on the question of Church unity, and replying to the point whether the episcopate is scriptural, says:

Our Church has never claimed scriptural authority for any theory of the episcopate. She maintains that Scripture and ancient authors together show that there have always been bishops in the Church. . . . But in what that succession consists—what is essential to the making of bishops . . . are matters upon which we have no rule or dogma. No Congregationalist could demand wider liberty of opinion on this point than that exercised by our own scholarly Lightfoot. His theory of the episcopate is accepted and taught, to the present writer's personal knowledge, in the leading Presbyterian seminary in this land, and it is not concealed from the students of our own General Seminary.

It is true that in the Preface to the Ordinal it is declared that there always have been the orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, but this is not saying that there must be three orders, or that a body which does not have them is not a Church. It does not necessarily imply that a non-episcopal government is not valid, but may be looked upon merely as a statement of what was believed to be an historical fact, rather than an assertion of the illegality of a ministry which is without three orders. One might believe that there have been three orders simply as a supposed fact of history, and yet disbelieve in their absolute necessity. So the requirement of "episcopal consecration or ordination" might be interpreted as the form of making their own ministers, rather than as denying the validity of ministers differently set apart in other denominations. It may, then, be assumed that there is a way of interpreting the formulaires of the Protestant Episcopal Church so that, even as they now stand, this Church need not deny the validity of non-episcopal ordination in non-episcopal bodies.

As the articles recognize the right of each Church to decide as to ceremonies, all that is necessary is to put this recognition of the validity of non-episcopal orders into practice, and admit ministers with non-episcopal orders from other Churches into Protestant Episcopal pulpits, and admit into its ministry without re-ordination such ministers as come duly accredited from other Churches. Let the Protestant Episcopal Church interpret the Preface to the Ordinal as referring simply to those candidates who come up regularly from the ranks of

their laity, and not as applying to full ministers in good standing in other branches of the Church of Christ, and the problem is solved.

An illustration of the idea suggested may be found in the practice of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It has two ordinations—that of deacons and that of elders—and all who come up regularly from the ranks of its laity submit to these two ordinations; but a minister of another denomination, where only one ordination is required for the full ministry, is freely admitted into a Methodist Episcopal pulpit, and such a clergyman may be admitted into the Methodist Episcopal ministry without any further ordination. So the Protestant Episcopal Church might be perfectly consistent if, while insisting upon its different ordinations according to its own form for those who come up in the ordinary way from the lay ranks, it took those who were already ministers in other Protestant Churches at the standing they had in the other Churches, admitting them on an equality with its own clergy to its pulpits, and, if satisfactory in other respects, admitting them to its clerical ranks without re-ordination. This would be a practical and practicable solution of the problem. In the same way, notwithstanding they continue to confirm those candidates who come up from their own congregations, yet, as the articles recognize other Churches and the right of Churches to vary in their ceremonies, they might receive members from the other Churches without confirmation, and simply upon the testimonials showing their standing as members in the other Churches; and this, by the way, is the practice in other Churches which have the rite of confirmation. They confirm their own candidates, but receive without confirmation members in good standing in other Churches where confirmation is not used.

The Anglican Churches can easily go back to the fraternal practice which prevailed for a long time after the Reformation in the Church of England, and accept the sentiment of their own Bishop Hall, who said :

Blessed be God, there is no difference, in any essential point, between the Church of England and her sister Reformed Churches. We unite in every article of Christian doctrine, without the least variation, as the full and absolute agreement between their public confessions and ours testifies. The only difference between

us consists in our mode of constituting the external ministry; and even with respect to this point we are of one mind, because we all profess to believe that it is not an essential of the Church (though in the opinion of many it is a matter of importance to her well-being); and we all retain a respectful and friendly opinion of each other, not seeing any reason why so small a disagreement should produce any alienation of affection among us.\*

As Bishop Hall considered that, though the English Church was episcopal and the other Reformed Churches were presbyterian, they did not differ "in any essential point," and that the English Church, as well as the others, agreed that this point on which they differed was "not an essential of the Church," so the Anglican Churches of to-day have it in their power to put the same view into practice, and end any alienation of affection which may exist.

If they fail in convincing the non-episcopal Churches that they should adopt an episcopal government, they may say with Bishop Hall :

But if a difference of opinion with regard to these points of external order must continue, why may we not be of one heart and of one mind? or, why should this disagreement break the bonds of good brotherhood?†

The responsibility in this movement rests largely with the Protestant Episcopal Church, for the other Protestant Churches are quite willing to fraternize, and it is encouraging that some leading ministers of that Church are ready to have their Church reciprocate the feeling. Its own salvation as a Protestant Reformed Church seems to necessitate closer fraternity with other Protestant Churches. This appears to be realized by certain Low-Churchmen, and in the struggle, now renewed, for the preservation of their body as a Protestant Church and to check the rising tide of Romish ritualism; they should have the warmest sympathy of all other Protestants; and it is to be hoped that steady agitation during the next few years will give them success.

The limits of this article prevent the presentation of many points which are pertinent, but, from what has been said, the way to a brotherly union between the different denominations is plain. What is needed is, that the Protestant Episcopal Church shall come out squarely and recognize in its best

\* Bishop Hall's *Irenicum*, published in 1647.

† *Ibid.*

sense the principle of liberty, equality and fraternity as applied to the other Protestant Churches: First, the liberty of each Christian Church to decide as to its own polity; second, the equality of the ministers and members of these Churches with its own; and, third, the fraternal interchange with the other Churches. If the Protestant Episcopal Church will do this, there will be fraternal union at once, and this it can do on the basis of its own articles and the ancient practice of the Anglican Church. Other denominations may say, that as far as they are individually concerned they can get along without any such recognition or affiliation, and it must be admitted there is a sense in which this is true. They may say they ask no favors, yet at the same time they should welcome the development and manifestation of a fraternal spirit on the part of all. While they deny any superiority on the part of another branch of the Christian Church, they may sincerely rejoice at a growing spirit of brotherhood; and, while they yield no principle, they should encourage the desire in others for fraternal relations, mutual recognition, and Christian co-operation on the part of all Protestant Churches.

In view of the advances of Romanism, as well as of the teaching of the Head of the Church, it behooves Protestant Churches to recognize their common brotherhood when they agree on the essentials of faith and practice; and to consider agreement on matters of polity as non-essential until they come together, not in organic unity, it may be, but in "the unity of the Spirit," and thus fulfill the prayer of Jesus "that they all may be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me. And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me." John xvii, 21-23 (Rev. Ver.).

## ART. IV.—JABEZ BUNTING, D.D.\*

THIS very extraordinary man, who was so distinguished in the annals of Wesleyan Methodism in the parent body, departed this life in 1858. Soon after his demise the first volume of his life was issued, and was read with great interest on both sides of the Atlantic; but, strange to say, the admirers and friends of Dr. Bunting have had to wait more than a quarter of a century for the final volume, which contains the most important events of his life.

Dr. Bunting's son, Percival, the author of these memoirs, was a member of the legal profession, and a man of rare ability, and, notwithstanding the filial relation in which he stood to the departed, has performed his delicate task with great impartiality and fidelity. Being himself an ardent Methodist, and one who has always taken great interest in its affairs, he was thoroughly conversant with the important transactions that occurred during his father's memorable career. Always being of delicate constitution, he performed his labor of love in the midst of great suffering, and before he could reach the end of the work he had undertaken he was called from labor to rest. His friend, the Rev. George S. Rowe, then entered upon the duties of biographer, and to him the Methodist people in both hemispheres are under obligation for finishing a biography for which they have long been anxiously waiting.

Soon after the first volume was issued an article was published, in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* for 1860, from the pen of the late Robert A. West. Mr. West was at one time a Methodist in England, and being the son and grandson of a Wesleyan minister he was well acquainted with the workings of Methodism in the mother country. He had long known Dr. Bunting, hence he was well qualified to write an appreciative article respecting the early career, which the first volume portrays, of his eminent friend.

The life of Dr. Bunting as now published will long be a standard in Methodism, and as it contains notices of so vast

\* *The Life of Jabez Bunting, D.D.* With Notices of Contemporary Persons and Events. By his Son, THOMAS PERCIVAL BUNTING. With additions by Rev. GEORGE STRINGER ROWE. Vols. I, II. New York: Harper & Brothers.

a number of "cotemporary persons and events" it may be almost designated an encyclopedia. It will certainly be a valuable repertory for all the students of Methodism for many years to come.

A love-feast is held in all the Methodist Societies in England once in three months. To obtain admittance into these love-feasts the members show their tickets to the door-keeper. Such as are not members receive notes of admission from the minister; but the same persons are not usually admitted on more than two or three occasions, unless they become members of the Church. Jabez Bunting was a lad in his teens when Alexander Mather, a strict disciplinarian, became superintendent of the circuit; and as a number of such boys had been accustomed to attend the love-feasts without becoming church members he soon intimated his intention to put a stop to such proceedings. The biographer says:

The first love-feast after his (Mr. Mather's) arrival saw Jabez Bunting shut out. His mother seized the opportunity to talk with him on spiritual things. Perhaps even she was not then aware of the effect produced upon him by Mr. Benson's preaching. "I do not know what you think of it, Jabez," she said; "but to me it seems an awful thing that after having been carried there (probably she thought of the time when she had carried him to the chapel for Wesley's blessing) you should now be excluded by your own fault." He once said in a meeting of the kind, "Many attribute their conversion to their having attended a love-feast; I owe mine to having been shut out of one."

Jabez Bunting always recognized the Rev. Joseph Benson as his spiritual father, though doubtless the above singular circumstance helped to bring him to a decision respecting religion; it was some time afterward when, "standing on his father's door-step one day, he did embrace and realize the glorious fact of Christ being the propitiation for the sins of mankind, and ventured himself on Christ, and was consciously pardoned and accepted. He 'was set at liberty.' Having 'much forgiven, he loved much.' His heart was 'enlarged, inflamed, and filled' with new and heavenly affections. He was 'turned about' 'from sin to God.' He had a new will and a new command of it; his desires, courses, and pursuits, his entire life—'all things'—became 'new.' This was his conversion."

When Jabez Bunting had attained the age of nineteen he

was made a local preacher. He had already been employed as a prayer leader, and had occasionally given a word of exhortation. All who knew him believed that he possessed gifts such as, if rightly used, might make him an acceptable and useful minister of the Gospel. His educational advantages were not equal to those enjoyed by young people at the present day, but vastly superior to many of his contemporaries. His residence for a few years in the house of Dr. Percival, where he not only pursued medical studies but also acted as amanuensis to that gentleman, afforded him good opportunities to acquire much general knowledge. He was a diligent student, and sought to make the best use possible of the position he now occupied to increase his stock of useful information. The habits he formed were useful to him through life, as he was always accustomed to give himself wholly to any subject which he might wish to master. He was no smatterer, and never did things by halves; but sought to master all the details of every question that excited attention. This, we believe, may be considered as the principal cause of the great influence which he acquired in the Wesleyan Conference. He sought to understand matters thoroughly, and could always give an opinion which was worthy of consideration.

The very first sermon preached by Jabez Bunting gave evidence of having been carefully studied. This remark would apply to all his discourses. Some partial friends who heard him preach the first time declared that this first effort was never excelled during the whole of his subsequent life, which extended over fifty years; but our readers will agree with us that in this instance friendship blinded judgment, though we do not doubt but that the sermon in question was a remarkable production for one who was just "buckling on the armor." It is also true that as a sermonizer Mr. Bunting soon attained great eminence. Most, if not all, of his sermons which have been published were written when he was a comparatively young man and had not completed his probation. The late Rev. W. L. Thornton, who was a man of fine scholarly attainments, in a notice of Dr. Bunting's sermons, which were published in two volumes, said "that it was marvelous that a young divine should so soon have become able to compose such sermons as are to be found in these volumes."

Another reviewer, in writing respecting the same volumes, says:

There is a certain peculiar dignity in these discourses which is not, though certainly intellectual in its character, that of soaring imagination or recondite thought, but that of a great preacher, mighty in the Scriptures, and inspired with the verity, the majesty, and the solemnity of his commission. There is likewise a beauty of style which is all his own; not that of rhetoric or of fancy, but of a perfect command over the simplest, the fittest, and the most luminous language.

After mentioning one sermon as a fine illustration of the minister's style, and his Scripture quotations, the reviewer continues :

The rays of light thus collected, the full conception and practical application of the subject, and the clearness and precision of the arrangement, show in this and in other sermons the hand of a master in Israel. We are persuaded that the publication of such discourses will not only honor Dr. Bunting's memory, but, as long as pure taste, earnest piety, and scriptural divinity prevail among us, will perpetuate something of his pulpit power and continue to edify the Church.

As a further proof of the maturity of his talents as a sermonizer, we may state that when he had only been about a dozen years in the ministry he was entreated to publish a sermon which he had preached on "Justification by Faith," of which a reviewer many years afterward said that it was "perhaps the most complete and faultless doctrinal sermon that was ever preached or penned." It became a standard publication, and went through several editions, and we believe it is still one of the books which probationers for the Wesleyan ministry are expected to read. But we must return to our narrative.

As might be expected, a young man who had given such proofs of qualification for the Christian ministry as Jabez Bunting had done, in the short space of one year that he filled the office of local preacher, was sure to be called by the Church to turn aside from secular pursuits and give himself wholly to the ministry of the word. Accordingly, in 1799, he obeyed the "call," and went to his first circuit, which was Oldham, near Manchester, to which he traveled in true Methodist style, with a pair of saddle-bags hung over his shoulder, which contained his wearing apparel and library. His whole stock of sermons consisted of fourteen skeletons.

The circuit, though not deserving the name of "Hard-scrabble," was extensive, and afforded abundant labor for himself and his colleague. It was what might be termed "a six weeks' circuit," as it took this length of time to preach in every place. He remained here two years, and became so popular that his services were often sought after for occasional services, and more than one circuit memorialized the Conference to secure his appointment. But he always left his appointment in the hands of those to whom it legitimately belonged.

While on this his first circuit, though only in his novitiate, he gave evidence of that independence of mind and thorough acquaintance with Methodist law for which he was always distinguished. A question was mooted in the quarterly meeting during the discussion of which it was thought that the ministers should retire, as they had usually done when such cases were being discussed; but the young man soon intimated that he would not obey their wishes, as the custom in question had no authority in Methodist law. The resolute manner in which he "stood by his order" startled some of the lay brethren, and one at least could not restrain his anger as he declared that "a good rule had that day been set aside to please that proud son of Adam, Jabez Bunting."

Young Bunting's first superintendent, the Rev. John Gaulter, was always proud of "his young man," and as his term on Oldham Circuit expired at the close of Mr. Bunting's first year he wrote to him frequently after they ceased to be colleagues. Mr. Gaulter was a humble, holy man. In one of his letters he tells Mr. Bunting of having received a letter from Dr. Coke, who was then in America, the contents of which surprised him. He says:

The doctor brings strange things to my ears. A Methodist preacher of the name of Lyall (so his name is spelled in the American Minutes) is chosen the chaplain of the Congress. The doctor's own words are, "Brother Lyall, one of our elders, has been elected lately chaplain of the Congress by a great majority. He preaches in the Congress Hall, in Washington, on Sundays." What a rise from obscurity to notice, from contempt to honor! The good doctor is flushed with delight, and it certainly forms an epoch in the history of Methodism. Perhaps I may yet live to see my friend Bunting a doctor, and chaplain to an imperial Parliament. My prayer shall ever be, "Give us not honor without grace."

Mr. Bunting did become a doctor, but he never became chaplain to an imperial Parliament. Methodist ministers do not receive such honors in England. Had Mr. Gaulter lived eighty years after the date of his letter to his friend Bunting how would he have been overwhelmed with surprise to have seen the honors which the sons of Methodism receive in the western world! All our readers will, we are sure, join us in saying Amen to the good man's prayer for Methodism: "Give us not honor without grace."

The years of Mr. Bunting's probation were spent in two circuits, in both of which he made full proof of his ministry. He was then received into full connection by the Conference, with twenty-nine others, one of whom was the peerless orator of his day, Robert Newton, with whom Jabez Bunting then formed an acquaintance. They were ever afterward warm friends, and no two ministers were better known in Wesleyan Methodism than they. Their rare talents, though greatly differing, eminently qualified them for the positions which they filled in the Church of their choice.

Notwithstanding the qualifications which young Bunting possessed, he was more than once the subject of intense anxiety, being afraid that he had entered upon a work for which he was not duly qualified. One evening, when attending a week-night appointment in Oldham Circuit, he sat up until a late hour and held a conversation with the goodman of the house, during which he expressed his fears that "he should not be able to find materials to hold out even for six months." The next day he remained in his room from morning until night, wrestling with God in prayer that he might know the divine will, during which he did not take his accustomed meals. Our readers will agree with us in the opinion that Jabez Bunting, who was just now buckling on his Christian armor, took the right course to settle the question of his call to the ministry.

He soon attained to eminence as a faithful minister of the Gospel, and, while he was a diligent student of theology and did not confine himself to one class of authors, it will be readily supposed that Arminian writers were his favorites. He was emphatically Methodistic in his theological creed. He once told a friend of the present writer that "he had read one of the Rev. John Wesley's sermons daily during the preceding

thirty years." Jabez Bunting also embraced every opportunity to hear other ministers preach. This was particularly the case when he was stationed in London the first time, and during the first years of his ministry, when religious services were not held in Methodist places of worship during "church hours." The term of his probation, which extended to four years, was very laborious. Besides giving close attention to his studies he "preached no less than thirteen hundred and forty-eight times, and at the end of the second year had nearly a hundred sermons ready for use as he might require them."

Jabez Bunting made free use of the pen when pursuing his studies. His biographer says :

He carefully copied and preserved skeletons and sketches of sermons. He extracted from his general reading every thing that could suggest topics or materials for public discourse. He tried his hand in amending other men's compositions. His own preparations were full and elaborate, and were subjected to continual revision.

The sermons which he composed during his novitiate were used to a greater or lesser extent during his entire ministry, with but few emendations or additions. This proves how early he attained to maturity.

In the delivery of his sermons Dr. Bunting was very powerful. A friend whose circuit he had recently visited wrote him saying :

I shall never cease to be thankful for the visit you paid us last August, and others besides myself have cause to remember it. The sermon you preached at Newcastle was blessed to many. A man who lives in a neighboring village, who was much inclined to drunkenness and deism, was convinced of sin that morning. In attempting to give me an account of the sermon, and of its effect upon him, he said, "O, what a *serment* that was! Every word cut." Since then he has joined the Society and has preaching in his house. Several of his neighbors are awakened, and I hope much good will be done.

Bunting's biography contains many other instances of the power of his preaching.

During the period of his active ministry his labors were confined to the principal towns of England, where the congregations were invariably very large. Once he and his friend, Robert Newton, were colleagues in the same circuit. Their

residences were in close proximity, and there was seldom a day when they were both at home that they did not meet at either house. They were truly of one heart, and were knit together like David and Jonathan. Their wives were as much attached to each other as their husbands, and when together they often spoke in a friendly way respecting their talents. On one of these occasions Mrs. Bunting said to Mrs. Newton, "Your husband at times preaches very great sermons, but my husband never preaches a little one."

When stationed in Sheffield, James Montgomery, the Christian poet, whose compositions are still used in many Churches, was accustomed to hear him, and ever afterward he embraced every opportunity to sit under his ministry. In writing to the biographer he thus gives an estimate of the general character of Dr. Bunting's preaching :

He is a great man ; he delivers the most important scriptural truths in such a way as to make them appear plain and familiar ; so much so, indeed, that some of his intelligent hearers are occasionally almost tempted to believe they could themselves do what he does with so much apparent ease ; yet they are very much mistaken ; for that very simplicity of language, which involves so much fullness and fitness of thought, shows also how perfectly the preacher has attained that "art to conceal art," which is the result of successful study. I heard him constantly when he was stationed at Sheffield several years since, and still remember many of his sermons.

Robert Hall once listened to one of his luminous and logical sermons, and described it as "a limpid stream of classic eloquence." When the Evangelical Alliance was formed, in which Dr. Bunting took an active part, Norman Macleod, in speaking of the founders of the Alliance, spoke of Bunting as "a noble man." Dr. Chalmers, on the same occasion, after spending an hour with him, said, "I have had a most exquisite interview with one of the best and wisest of men."

Dr. Leifchild, who was for many years a popular Congregational minister in London, says of Jabez Bunting when stationed in the metropolis : "I followed him from place to place. None that I had ever heard equaled him as a whole." Leifchild was then a young man and a Wesleyan local preacher, and this estimate of his beloved friend was written many years afterward.

One important feature in Dr. Bunting's career was his power in prayer. One who knew him well thus describes this important trait of his ministry :

We have heard many highly gifted men engage in this hallowed exercise, but we must confess that in him there has been a nearer approach to heaven, a mightier struggle with the Angel of the Covenant, a firmer hold on the horns of the altar, a stronger suggestion of God and man holding converse with each other as face to face, than in any other person, except Bramwell, that ever came under our notice. This is by no means a common occurrence. But, O, we have known seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord—seasons in which heaven has been open to earth—when a divine power has been felt—when an audience, through the intervention of his intercessory prayer, seemed only to have to ask in order to receive, and all in the congregation have been ready to exclaim in the language of the patriarch, "How dreadful is this place! this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven;" leaving the spot as though they had come from a visit to the world of spirits, and were entering upon a fuller preparation for their final departure from the present.

A scene which occurred at an ordination service in connection with the Wesleyan Conference is thus described by the Rev. Joseph Entwistle :

Thirty-six young men as probationers were admitted into the full work of the ministry. Mr. Bunting prayed with uncommon unction; it seemed as if heaven was opened. It was a time much to be remembered. God was remarkably present; my soul was melted before the Lord. Glory be to God!

When the Rev. James Calvert, of Fiji, returned to England after his first term of missionary labor in that land of cannibals, he attended the Conference for the first time, when Dr. Bunting prayed at a service similar to that described by Mr. Entwistle, and when writing to a friend respecting the occasion he said, "Dr. Bunting's prayer was agony."

From an early period of his ministry his gift in prayer was extraordinary. When his eldest son was born the father was from home, and on his return, when informed of what had taken place,

He fell on his knees and poured forth one of those prayers for which he was so remarkable, imploring, in particular, that, if God should so will, the child might become a Methodist preacher. The first fond wish of his fatherly heart was not denied to him.

Such was the esteem in which Dr. Bunting was held by the majority of the members of the Wesleyan Conference that he was placed in positions of great influence, first as secretary of Conference, then as its president, which position he occupied four times; an honor awarded to no other member of Conference so often except to his friend Robert Newton. He was also editor of the *Magazine*, and afterward missionary secretary. He was one of the original founders of the Missionary Society, which was formed in 1813, when Dr. Coke and his heroic band went from England to establish Wesleyan Missions in India. The end of that father of Methodist missions, who was the first bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is well known. Probably to no other man except Dr. Coke are Wesleyan missions so much indebted as to Dr. Bunting. In connection with his friend Richard Watson he drew up the constitution of the Missionary Society and the code of rules for the guidance of missionaries. His skill in managing difficult cases which sometimes arose, both at home and abroad, was of great service. Occasionally he had to act as a diplomatist in his intercourse with the civil authorities, and those with whom he was thus brought in contact were not slow to acknowledge his superior talents.

In 1839, which was the centenary year of Wesleyan Methodism, a series of services was held in every part of the Methodistic world. Those held under the auspices of the Wesleyan Conference in England were largely controlled and directed by Dr. Bunting. The series of resolutions adopted at the inaugural meeting, which consisted of an equal number of ministers and laymen, were drawn up by him, and were adopted with but little alteration. It had been estimated that the thank-offerings of the people of Great Britain and Ireland would probably amount to four hundred thousand dollars; but instead of this, the sum of more than ten hundred thousand dollars was contributed, all of which was expended on behalf of missions, ministerial education, reduction of debts on places of worship, and the fund established for the benefit of superannuated ministers. When the amount contributed became known both the friends and foes of Wesleyan Methodism were astonished, and the Rev. Thomas Jackson, who was president of the Conference during the centenary year, declared that so

large a sum of money had never before been contributed by any branch of the Christian Church since the time when David and the children of Israel contributed so munificently to the erection of the temple at Jerusalem.

It has been a matter of wonder to many that Dr. Bunting did not give himself more to authorship, as with the exception of his sermon on "Justification by Faith," and the sermons of his spiritual father, the Rev. Joseph Benson, which he edited, it is not known that he ever prepared any works for publication. Of course we do not include the magazines and the Minutes of Conference which were published during the years that he was connectional editor, when he also revised Cruden's Concordance. He was often importuned to engage in literary work, and at one period of his life he entered into negotiations with the Rev. T. Hartwell Horne to assist him with his great work entitled *Introduction to the Critical Study of the Holy Scriptures*, but he felt obliged to relinquish all literary work, saying, "The die is cast. If I give to our missions the attention which they require I shall not have any time hereafter for literature."

On another occasion he said to a friend, "My attention has been so much engrossed with Methodist polities and the concerns of the Connection that I have had but little time for other pursuits." No doubt all who knew Dr. Bunting would readily assent to the truth of this remark, and, whatever views may be entertained respecting his policy, it is nevertheless creditable to him that, having sacrificed the prospect of a lucrative profession in Manchester to become a Methodist minister, he gave himself so wholly to the active work of Methodism that he had no time for any thing else.

Jabez Bunting was sometimes declared to have been "a man of war" from his youth. At other times he was stigmatized as the "great Jabez." Great men often have to endure merciless criticism, and are the subjects of much misrepresentation and slander. It would be difficult to mention the name of any public man in modern times who received a greater share of obloquy than fell to his lot. It was marvelous how he could hold on his way in the midst of so many opposing influences.

The first case of controversy in which he was involved was

concerning the Sunday-schools at Sheffield. It had been the custom for many years to teach the children to write on the Lord's day. Those connected with the management of the schools were disposed to be very exclusive in their government, and, as far as they could do so, they would not admit ministers into their councils. The circuit ministers had often deplored this state of things, but they seemed to be powerless, until Jabez Bunting took the matter in hand. He first of all contended for the sacredness of the Lord's day, and recommended that an evening in the week should be set apart to teach the children writing; but the teachers refused to change their course. He was necessitated to avail himself of the aid of the church courts; and finally the matter was referred to Conference, when rules and regulations were adopted for the management of the Wesleyan Sunday-schools. Those opposed to the course of Dr. Bunting wrote several pamphlets in which they denounced him as an ecclesiastical despot, and made the Sunday-school question a pretext to agitate for changes in the Methodist Discipline which, up to that time, had never been heard of. The result was, that some of the chief agitators were brought to trial and expelled from the Church.

Some were now pleased to assert that the minister in question was grasping for power, and that he was an enemy to the liberties of the people. Here we must aver that we think his accusers charged him wrongfully, for about this time a second school for the education of ministers' sons was established, and, on his recommendation, the Conference appointed a mixed committee, consisting of an equal number of ministers and laymen, to secure a site and to superintend the erection. This was a new thing in Methodism. There had never been such a committee before, and some of the leading ministers were afraid of the innovation; but, as one has said, "No man ever undertook greater things in Methodism than he has done, yet he has undertaken nothing in which he has not succeeded;" so in the case of "mixed committees," he believed the principle to be a sound one, and he acted upon it through life, especially where finances were concerned. It might be said that the lay-gentlemen selected to act on "mixed committees" were not chosen by the people, but by the Conference. This witness is true; but then it will certainly be admitted that the ministers were

best acquainted with the laymen throughout the Connection, and could therefore make the best selection. Besides, the selection of laymen for the purposes named was an experiment, and if it had not been successful, why was not another mode of election provided?

In the year 1827 there was an agitation in Leeds respecting the introduction of an organ into one of the Methodist churches of that town. It may be observed that the Conference of 1796 had decided that no such instruments should be used in Methodist churches without the approval of the Conference; the fathers of Methodism were jealous lest any thing should spoil the service of song which was such a powerful auxiliary in their mode of worship.

At Leeds the trustees were anxious to erect an organ, as they believed it would be a great help, rather than a hinderance, to the devotions of the congregation. Methodism was a powerful organization in Leeds: several of the leading men were persons of great influence in their respective spheres of life. A goodly number of the local preachers and class-leaders, to say nothing of the ministers and private members, were opposed to the action of the trustees, and now began an agitation which continued for years, in which the ministers who were concerned were held up to public derision; they were denounced as "tyrants," "faithless," "mercenary," "promoters" of a "tyranny of the worst and most alarming character." It was recommended that they should be "starved" into compliance with the wishes and views of their opponents.

When the Conference took action on this unhappy case there was an earnest wish to heal the breach, and, to secure this, the president for the time being, and several other ministers, were sent to Leeds to confer with the dissentients. Dr. Bunting was one of the number sent, but he was soon "spoken of as the master and ruler of the Conference," which they declared he "had quite enslaved." This was surely a marvelous testimony, for he had only been a member of the legal Conference about ten years, and he was associated with such venerable men as Benson, Moore, Adam Clarke, Entwistle, Stephens, and others who were the "giants" of Methodism in those days.

All the attempts made by the Conference delegation to effect a reconciliation, and restore peace to the churches in Leeds,

were in vain. Those opposed to the introduction of the organ were like some others who have disturbed the peace of the churches—they claimed the right to demand\* changes in the Discipline of the Church which some at least regarded as unnecessary. Attempts were made to draw the officials of other circuits into the agitation, and thereby make the rent in Methodism worse than it would be if confined to Leeds.

For the sake of restoring peace some of the leading dissentients were brought to trial, and expelled as disturbers of the harmony of the Church. Those who sympathized with them withdrew and formed themselves into another denomination, known as the Protestant Methodists. Hundreds of pious persons were induced by the spirit of faction to leave the Church through whose instrumentality they had been rescued from sin. No one would suppose that those who had taken up arms against the introduction of an organ into a Wesleyan church would be so inconsistent as to introduce one into a church of their own, and yet they did so at a very early period of their history. It is but due to the memory of Dr. Bunting to state in this connection that he was originally opposed to the introduction of musical instruments into places of worship; he designated them as “abominations;” and was especially opposed to organs on the ground of expense. On his recommendation the Conference ordered that no such instruments should be introduced where debts would be thereby incurred. Further legislation was also adopted regulating the erection of church edifices, with a view to lessen the burdens of the people as much as possible. As the trustees at Leeds acted on these regulations he contended that they had a right to erect an organ in their church.

In the year 1833 England was greatly agitated on various political questions, during which the temporalities of the Established Church were often referred to, and a distinguished nobleman in the House of Lords warned the bench of bishops “to set their house in order.” An Anti-State-Church Society was formed, with its headquarters in London, and branches were organized in various provincial towns. Ministers and laymen of the dissenting bodies joined the said society in great numbers. The Wesleyan Methodists generally stood aloof. Probably this arose from the fact that most of the leaders of Methodism were conservative in their political opinions, and were

friendly to the Established Church, as Mr. Wesley was to the end of his days.

A popular young minister, the son of one who a few years before was president of the Conference, saw fit to connect himself with the Anti-State-Church Association. He spoke at some of its meetings, and even became secretary of one of the provincial branches. As a matter of course he was brought to trial, as he had violated some of the laws of the body. This he did not attempt to deny, but insisted that he had acted conscientiously in what he had done. At the trial he was asked to sever his connection with the said society, as by refusing to do so he was compromising the denomination of which his father and himself were honored ministers. He refused, and was therefore suspended until Conference, and as he insisted that he still had a right to preach, though suspended, he was informed by the president of Conference that "he would be regarded as being guilty of contumacy."

The suspension of the Rev. Joseph Rayner Stephens was the occasion of great agitation in Ashton-under-Lyne, where he was stationed, and in Lancashire generally, where political reformers were numerous. Many rallied around him, and refused to hear those whom they believed to be opposed to their favorite minister, and were severe in their denunciations of Robert Newton and Jabez Bunting; especially the latter, because they regarded him as the "ruler" of the president, which office Newton filled when Stephens was suspended.

At the Conference the case was again considered, and was the occasion of a lengthy discussion. Dr. George Smith, in his *History of Wesleyan Methodism*, refers at great length to the proceedings of the Conference on the case. Some of the views expressed by members of the Conference would excite the surprise of many of our readers. The offender was assured that if he would withdraw from the objectionable society, and cease all agitation, he should at once be restored to the confidence of his brethren. Some proposed a milder course, but they were in the minority. The venerable Henry Moore "warned the Conference to beware of men with whims; some had the whim of conscience, some the whim of honor—'by men called honor, but by angels pride.' " Theophilus Lessey "thought the preachers should be more united, they must sub-

mit to the decisions of the district meeting." Dr. Beaumont said, he was altogether a Methodist, and thought the district meeting had done its duty, and that Stephens should have submitted. But he added :

Wesley's bearing toward the Church was like that of a rower in a boat; his face was always steadily fixed on the Church, but every stroke of his oars took him farther away from it. He objected to be tacked in any way to the Church of England.

Mr. Stephens asked time to consider what he should do. His request was granted, and next day he intimated that he could not comply with the wish of the Conference, and would therefore retire from the Methodist ministry. He did so. Many of his former friends rallied around him, and he became their minister. He preached in Ashton for several years, and took an active part in laboring on behalf of the society before mentioned, but always maintained a friendly feeling for the Wesleyans.

Our readers, we think, will agree with us in the opinion that the Wesleyan Conference should not have come to such a decision as they did in the case of Mr. Stephens. We feel certain that such a course would not be pursued at the present day. A few years ago the Rev. John Bond spoke at a meeting of the Liberation Society in London, and though he did so against the remonstrance of the president, the late Dr. Punshon, yet we are not aware that he received even a censure at the ensuing Conference. Many Dissenters regard the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England as the strongest supporter of the Established Church, and no doubt they are right. So long as Methodism maintains its present attitude the day of disestablishment is at a great distance, but it will not always do so. The rising ministry of Methodism are not disposed to bear the intolerance of "the clergy" as their fathers were wont to do. Since the death of Dr. Bunting another spirit seems to animate the Wesleyan Conference.

Hardly had the noise of battle been hushed when a still more furious war was proclaimed. For many years Dr. Bunting and those who agreed with him had been desirous to adopt some means whereby the rising ministry could have the advantages of a theological education. Some of the fathers who then survived condemned the proposal. In 1808, Adam

Clarke was favorable to the project, but Bradburn said "it was a grand trick of the devil."

After more than a quarter of a century had passed away the idea of a collegiate institution became more generally entertained. It was not anticipated that there would be strong opposition against the project, but those who were of this opinion were soon convinced of their error. Dr. Warren, who was a minister of considerable ability, became the leader of the oppositionists, though at first he zealously advocated the formation of the institution. Some thought he was disappointed in not being nominated for the position of theological tutor, and his jealousy of and opposition to Dr. Bunting was great. When the matter was discussed in Conference Dr. Warren took advantage of his position, and made several attacks on Dr. Bunting instead of speaking to the motion recommending that a theological institution should be established, which motion ultimately prevailed.

This was a wise decision, but we think that the committee which was appointed to complete the details committed an egregious blunder in insisting that Dr. Bunting should be the president of the institution. He was worthy of the honor and had eloquently pleaded for the institution, but it was well known that there was a strong feeling of opposition against him, and the poorer members especially regarded his plans with suspicion. The Doctor himself did not desire the appointment, and is reported to have said "that he would not accept the office unless the preachers should insist on it, with the threat of expulsion if he did not consent." Compelling Dr. Bunting to accept the office was an unwise policy, as it gave Dr. Warren and his friends strong reasons, as they conceived, for agitation.

Dr. Warren and his associates became violent, and soon a pamphlet was issued attacking the course pursued by the Conference, and denouncing the institution in the most severe terms. A course of agitation was entered upon which no private remonstrance nor any other means could suppress. Dr. Warren was told what his brethren would be compelled to do unless he refrained from the course of agitation on which he had entered; but he was resolute, and, consequently, he was brought to trial and suspended from ministerial functions until Conference. But nothing could deter him; he even appealed

to the civil courts, the court of chancery, etc., from which he obtained no redress, and at the following Conference he was expelled from the Connection.

But few members of the Conference sympathized with Dr. Warren, and we do not know that one approved of his agitating course. After his expulsion a goodly number of people in various parts of the Connection professed to espouse his cause, but, like other agitators who had preceded them, they showed their animus in demanding changes in Methodism which accorded with their views, and accompanied those demands with threats to "stop the supplies." The result was that another division took place in Methodism, which left the parent body somewhat reduced in numbers; but, for a few years at least, there was peace, and the Connection pursued a more vigorous course of missionary labor abroad and church consolidation at home. The very year in which Dr. Warren was expelled the mission at Fiji was begun, the grandeur of which, we opine, has never been surpassed in the annals of the Christian Church. Dr. Warren did not continue long with the agitators, but sought episcopal ordination, and became a minister of a small parish in Manchester called "All Souls." Owing to the small congregation to which he ministered, a waggish writer said "he did not know how many souls there were, but he felt certain there were not many bodies."

The *Fly Sheet* controversy was the most disastrous that ever occurred in Wesleyan Methodism. The centenary services which had just been held had given Methodism a position such as it never had before. No doubt those services resulted in increasing Dr. Bunting's power and influence in the body. Those who did not approve of his policy became restive, and doubtless were envious of the favors which they believed were conferred on those who seemed to be the special friends of the doctor. The historian of Methodism, Dr. Smith, is of the opinion that the Conference was too desirous to concentrate official authority and responsibility in his hands, and as he was always a true friend many were greatly attached to him; and while, doubtless, their motives might be pure, there can be no doubt but that others who surrounded him were "self-interested followers as well as friends." The Conference acted unwisely in the course it pursued toward Dr. Bunting. Had the honors at its

disposal been distributed more widely, we believe that the sad disasters of 1849 would not have occurred.

The *Fly Sheets* professed to expose abuses which then existed in the Wesleyan Church. The writers withheld their names. The sheets at first were sent by mail to the ministers only, and for a few years they produced effects which were fearful. However much truth they might contain, the rancor and personal abuse of which they were full to overflowing were shocking. Other sheets were published, professedly in vindication of Methodism, which were as full of bitterness and acrimony as the *Fly Sheets* themselves. The Conference was now divided into two parties, and for some years each party tried to elect one of its friends to the presidential chair. At one Conference, when the successful candidate was known to be an opponent to Dr. Bunting, that gentleman said, as he took the chair, "You are the leader of a faction."

It is not necessary to enter here into the details of this sad contest, but only to state that after the expulsion of the alleged authors of the *Fly Sheets*, it resulted in the severance of about 100,000 members from the parent body, some of whom united with other denominations, but the majority, with two of the expelled ministers, joined the dissentients of 1835, and the denomination is now known as the "United Methodist Free Church."

Dr. Bunting was justly regarded as the leader of the party in the Conference which discountenanced every recommendation which it was thought would lessen the influence of those in power. In politics, no doubt, he and many others in the Conference would be called Liberal Conservatives, and of course they could not sanction any thing which professed to be "reform." He possessed marvelous influence, and was the "master mind" of the Methodist Church. He had a kind heart, and never forgot his friends. Ministers and influential laymen of other communities held him in high esteem. As previously stated, he was one of the first members of the Evangelical Alliance, and was on friendly terms with other branches of Methodism, and occasionally occupied their pulpits. When the infirmities of age crept upon him his friends subscribed a fund of about forty thousand dollars, out of which Dr. Newton and himself were paid life annuities of one thousand dollars

each, which at their decease reverted to the Missionary Society.

We ask, then, in view of the influence which Dr. Bunting wielded for so many years in the Wesleyan Conference, could he not have used that influence to prevent the expulsion of ministers who were as truly called of God to preach the Gospel as he was? No charge of immorality was ever preferred against them, and not even a suspicion of moral delinquency ever tarnished their reputation. We do not defend anonymous slanderers, and seldom read any letters which are published without the signature of their writers; but Dr. Bunting could not but know that some of those concerning whom the *Fly Sheet* writers wrote were not men of "clean hands." The man whose immense influence enabled him to effect such great changes in the legislation of Methodism, by the formation of mixed committees and other conference acts, could have utilized the suggestions of the *Fly Sheet* writers, and could have provided for a mixed conference, as has since been done, and his name would have shone with still greater luster in the page of Methodist history. We revere his memory, and doubt if there will ever be another man in Wesleyan Methodism who will possess the influence which was wielded by Jabez Bunting. Peace be to his ashes! He sleeps in City Road burying-ground, near the graves of John Wesley, Adam Clarke, Joseph Benson, and other fathers of Methodism.\*

\* In preparing this paper the writer has referred to a number of volumes written by various Methodist authors, but is especially indebted to the *History of Wesleyan Methodism*, by George Smith, LL.D.

## ART. V.—EPISCOPAL FUNCTIONS IN METHODISM.

It is the purpose of this paper to discuss principles, not men. The bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church have usually been selected for their high office from the ranks of the abler ministry of the denomination. From Thomas Coke to the last elected they have been good men. Personally they merit that high consideration which is almost universally accorded them; by their pure lives, by their wise and paternal administration in office, they have honored the Church which has honored them. In discussing, then, the assigned functions of the episcopal office the personality of the incumbents of this office is not a factor to be considered. The remembrance of this fact is essential to an unbiased study of the question before us.

While the practical plea of this paper is for some modification of the law of the Church concerning the functions of the bishops, it should also be clearly borne in mind by the reader that the writer aims his strictures at the letter of the law rather than at the spirit in which the law has usually been administered. The world has probably never witnessed a more conscientious or brotherly wielding of authority than that which, as a rule, has been exhibited by Methodist bishops. The necessity for a modification of the law grows out of reasons that can in no way cast discredit upon either the spirit or wisdom of these chief officers in the Church.

The plan of this paper will be as follows:

I. To state, and to characterize in some measure, some of the functions of the episcopal office.

II. To present reasons which call for some modification of these functions.

III. To advocate a plan which, in the judgment of the writer, will meet the necessities of the case, and greatly serve the interests of the Church.

I. An unwritten qualification of Methodist bishops is, that they must be great preachers. This demand is not unreasonable. There is no class of men who have such exceptional opportunities for making themselves felt on great occasions. Their pulpit lightning does not often strike twice in the same place, but they preach to great and representative congregations. They

preach before the Annual Conferences, their services are solicited for the great camp-meetings, they are in demand for dedication occasions and for college commencements. The very position of these chief pastors carries with it the requirement that its incumbents should show themselves masters and models in the pulpit. If there is any man whose commission would liken him to the angel of the Apocalypse, flying between the heavens and the earth with the everlasting Gospel, that man is a Methodist bishop; and when he drops down from his flight to preside at an Annual Conference it will be perfectly appropriate if his sermon to the ministers shall be like a trumpet call from the upper world.

The labors of the pastors are confined to limited fields. These workers toil on through the year, rarely hearing other sermons than their own. It is a great thing for these men, coming up to their Annual Conference, to hear from their bishop a sermon that shall broaden their views, quicken their faith, and inspire them with a larger heroism for the work to which he in a few days will send them forth again. The benefits to the younger ministers of great inspirations thus imparted can hardly be overestimated. The writer, when a student in Wesleyan University, was privileged to hear a sermon before the New York East Conference by Bishop Edward Thomson. There was a saintly power in that sermon which thrilled his very soul, and its influence, like a blessed spell, lingers in his memory to this hour. The Church, as by an intuition, expects great things of its bishops in the pulpit. The fitness of this expectation was somewhat characteristically expressed by a Western layman at the last General Conference. When asked why he was so interested to secure the election of a certain man he said: "I go for him because he is a great preacher. I don't believe in any man for the bishopric who can't preach. When I invite a bishop to my town I expect him to preach so that the whole place will be Methodist for at least the next twelve months."

If, now, we turn to look specifically at the disciplinary demands laid upon the episcopal office we shall find them nothing less than formidable, as the following enumerated but incomplete list will serve to show:

1. The bishops *ex officio* are presiding officers of nearly all

the great conventions—legislative, judicial, and for business purposes—in the Church.

2. Every bishop ought to be an expert in the rules and regulations of the Church. It is a part of his duty to decide all questions of law that may arise in the proceedings of an Annual Conference, and also to give rulings as a judge in Conferences assembled for judicial trial.

3. It is made the duty of the bishops to travel throughout the Connection, and to oversee all the temporal and spiritual interests of the Church. When we study the census of the Church, and find that it now numbers two millions of living members — when we take up the map of our connection and discover that it embraces all the grand divisions of the globe—then, surely, it would seem that this traveling throughout the Connection, and the superintendence of all the temporal and spiritual interests of this world-embracing Church, would often wring from these men, burdened in spirit and weary in brain, the expression of St. Paul, “Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon [us] daily, the care of all the Churches;” and force them to ask, with him, “Who is sufficient for these things?”

4. The bishops cannot properly discharge the functions assigned to them unless they are themselves men of broad, sound, and discriminating scholarship. It is certainly essential that they should be masters in the science of theology. It would be difficult to overstate the responsibility attaching to their office by reason of one duty assigned to that office. It is made the duty of the bishops to prescribe courses of reading and study for all candidates for the ministry of the Church; also to prescribe a course of reading and of study proper to be pursued in a four years' course by all who come into the Annual Conferences; and likewise to prescribe a similar course for all the local preachers of the denomination.

To supply the great and rapidly growing work of the Church requires about twelve thousand regular ministers, besides an army of local preachers. The successors of these numerous workers are constantly coming into the field. These thousands of men are to become public teachers. They are to be set in high places as defenders of the truth and as guides of thought at a time when creeds are challenged and faith is assailed as

never before. The age in which they are to do their work is one characterized by the most daring and searching criticisms of the Bible; an age when the brilliant discoveries of science are calling for readjustments of accepted truth; an age when the agitation of great economic questions, and the fierce conflicts between labor and capital, demand the demonstration, if such demonstration is possible, that the Christian religion carries with it the practical philosophy which, if applied, will most certainly calm the agitations of society, while at the same time it will secure the highest weal, enlightenment, and happiness of all men. This age, as never any other, calls for a Christian ministry prayerful, alert, loyal, enlightened, mighty. The young men that are now coming into the ranks of the Methodist itinerancy ought to leap into their places with the purpose of leadership; they need to be full-orbed and full-panoplied.

But these men themselves will be largely shaped by their courses of reading and study. The Church knows this, and it is a marked evidence of the almost unlimited confidence which the Church reposes in its bishops, that it assigns to them solely the duty of prescribing those courses of reading and of study which shall form the church curriculum for ministerial training. If for so important a purpose as this a carefully selected commission of the leading college and theological professors of the Church had been appointed to act conjointly with the bishops, it would seem at least to be a fitting arrangement. But so far as the letter of the requirement is concerned, the chairs of the colleges and theological schools are not consulted; the Church has chosen to place this grave and delicate responsibility entirely with the bishops. Infallibility is not predicated of Methodist bishops; but certainly this duty, which the Church requires at their hands, demands from them knowledge and wisdom as well-nigh perfect as can be found in any men upon the face of the earth.

5. It is made the duty of the bishops to fix the time for holding the Annual Conferences. The propriety of their having a decisive voice as to the time at which a Conference shall hold its session appears when it is remembered that the bishops are the presiding officers, and that the schedule of the Conference sessions must be so arranged as to permit these officers to pass from one Conference to another.

So far as the letter of the law is concerned, the bishops have absolute authority to decide the time for holding the sessions of the Annual Conferences, subject only to one limitation—they must permit an Annual Conference, if it so choose, to remain in session at least one week. That this authority is great is a fact of which the older Conferences have been slightly reminded, in the last few years, by the decision of the bishops to call their sessions one day later in the week than was formerly the custom.

6. Another very important function of the bishop is seen in his relation to the formation of districts. It is made his duty "to form the districts according to his judgment." It is natural to ask, Wherein does the fitness of this arrangement appear? The territory of the Church is divided into hundreds of presiding elders' districts. The formation of these districts as to size, plan, location, the number and the contiguity of churches which they include, involves vast consequences of toil and of travel to the presiding elders, and, it may be, matters of great spiritual and financial moment to the churches. No man who is so short a time in one place, and who travels so widely over the world as does a Methodist bishop, can reasonably be supposed to be so thoroughly acquainted with the geography of an Annual Conference, so intimately acquainted with the location of its churches, as to give him special qualification for the mapping or remapping of that Conference into districts. Probably the bishops do not average, in course of the year, more than a two-weeks' stay in the territory of each Conference over which they preside, except when they preside over a Conference in the bounds of which they have their residence. This being true, it is probable that in nearly every Conference there are at least a score of men whose judgment as to what ought to be done will be as good as that of the presiding bishop, while their intimate knowledge of the situation gives them, had they the authority, unquestionably superior advantages for making a wise arrangement of districts. If it should be said that the bishop never relies on his own unaided judgment in the formation of the districts, this may, as a general statement, be true. But, however much advisory help the bishop may need or have, the fact still remains that legally the authority to form the districts remains solely with him. Not a presiding elder, a preacher, a church, or all the churches on the district—all of whose interests are involved

—can assert a legal right to modify in any respect the bishop's decision.

This authority which the Church has committed to its bishops, of mapping out a great connection into districts that shall be shaped according to their own decision, is still another emphatic proof of the vast authority which the economy of Methodism legally lodges in the episcopal officer.

7. But the overtopping fact of interest in the episcopal office is, the authority of appointment conferred upon its incumbents. With the bishops resides the absolute authority to appoint to their stations all the presiding elders and the conference preachers in the Connection. The power to appoint the presiding elders and the preachers is, in both cases, the same ; but, for convenience of discussion, we will consider somewhat separately the significance of this power in its relation to these two classes of workers.

- The bishops appoint all the presiding elders. Whether this function is great or small, momentous or insignificant, depends almost entirely upon the uses which are made of the presiding eldership in the Church. What are the presiding elders for ? To the presiding elder many and important duties are assigned. He is the bishop's lieutenant, and within the limits of his district his powers are second only to those of the bishop. Within the limits of his district, and in the absence of the bishop, there is assigned to him, with the exception of authority to ordain, very nearly the full round of episcopal duties. He appoints all local preachers to supply work ; has power to change preachers from one charge to another ; has charge of all the elders, local preachers, and exhorters ; appoints times for holding the district and quarterly conferences ; licenses men to preach ; and, in short, is responsible for a general superintendence of all the temporal and spiritual interests of the churches. The presiding elder is the one superintendent who touches with some measure of constancy and familiarity all the interests of the preachers and the churches. He is the one man who, on the ground where his work is done, must stand face to face with the results of that work. He will therefore feel a constant motive to discharge his duties so wisely and so justly that the scrutiny of those whose interests his work affects shall not be able to discover just grounds of censure against him. In the light of the

disciplinary duties of the presiding eldership the authority vested in our bishops to appoint all the presiding elders for the connection appears something stupendous; but when it is remembered that an unwritten but necessitated law of usage assigns to the presiding elders duties which transcend in importance all the written requirements of the Discipline, then this absolute power of appointment assumes an amazing aspect. But of these unwritten requirements of the presiding eldership it will be more convenient to speak later.

The scope and significance of episcopal authority come somewhat adequately into view when it is seen that not less than twelve thousand conference preachers, and an equal number of pastoral charges, are subject annually to the power of appointment vested in eleven officers. The interests involved under this authority are great beyond the power of any one man to measure. Most of the twelve thousand preachers are men of families. A Methodist bishop when he comes to an Annual Conference brings with him authority to decide questions of vital moment to many households—questions which shall sensitively affect the welfare and happiness of wives and of children. Surely, if a wise head, a studious insight, and a paternal heart were not the known possessions of a man thus empowered, then his official visitation might be anticipated as a thing of inquisitorial dread. But the interests of the preachers and their families—great as these are—are not the greatest ones affected. All the pastoral charges, gathering into themselves the most vital interests of Christ's kingdom in the territories which they cover, are dependent upon the bishop's voice for the men who shall serve them as spiritual teachers and pastors.

In the practical discharge of their functions in these grave relations the bishops doubtless do, both from choice and necessity, seek careful counsel in the interests both of the preachers and the churches. But it still remains true that legally neither the preachers nor the churches have any voice in these appointments, which so greatly interest them both. If, concerning the appointments, the preachers are permitted to consult the bishops about the interests and preferences of themselves and their families—if the bishops give a patient and kindly hearing to committees from the churches—yet these facts are conceded

in usage rather than provided for in law. Legally, the authority of appointment, so greatly affecting the interests both of churches and preachers, remains solely and absolutely with the bishops.

In the view thus far presented the list of the disciplinary functions assigned to the episcopal office is by no means exhausted. The incidental demands made upon the bishops in connection with their required duties might justly take a large place in any review of episcopal work. But, passing by these and other considerations, enough has already been stated in this paper to form the basis for a few critical suggestions on the law of the Church as applied to its episcopacy.

II. The first suggestion under this branch of our subject which the writer ventures to offer is, that the law which places such immense and absolute authority of appointment in the hands of a few men is a law seemingly out of harmony with the age and country in which we live.

Some one will reply that this is mere sentiment. But in the evolutions of history wrought by Providence the world has steadily tended from the absolutism of individual rule to democracy. If history teaches any thing, one of its lessons would seem to be that this continent was reserved from the world's view to these later ages that it might be the theater on which an enlightened democracy should have adequate and unembarrassed opportunity to work out its most beneficent results. In the light of providential lessons, it might be regarded as something more than sentiment to affirm that the greatest Church in this freest of the world's republics is, so far as its provisions for manning its pulpits are concerned, one of the most undemocratic of Churches.

The reason for this autocratic power reposed in the episcopacy is something which we do not have to go far to seek. It is an inheritance which has come down to us without, to this day, receiving a challenge sufficiently effectual to change its character.

One of the most remarkable men that the world has ever known was John Wesley. He was pre-eminent in wisdom and in his genius as a legislator, as well as peerless in his marvelous energy and power of achievement. His life was consecrated by holy experiences, inspired by Christ-like

purpose, and fired by apostolic zeal. In an age when the Church needed God's trumpet-call to arouse it from a state of spiritual lethargy and death, Wesley came forth to discharge a mission not less important to Christ's kingdom than was that of Luther in the German Reformation. The world stood before the portals of a new era. A great and virgin continent was now ready to open its gates to the advent of a civilization which, in the near future, should mingle in its millions all the races of the earth. Whether this civilization should be Christian or semi-pagan would depend, more than upon any other single agency, upon a movement which was now coming to its life in the British Islands. He who does not see that the religious movement called Methodism is one of the most gigantic and decisive in its effects upon both English and American civilization has no eye for measuring moral factors in the movements of history. Without it or its equivalent in the last two centuries, the map of Christendom would be a different thing from what it is to-day. But it is safe to say that the Methodistic movement could never have been what it is without the consecrated leadership of John Wesley. He had the energy to enlist and to lead its forces, the wisdom to organize those forces for their best work, and, withal, that supreme personal devotion to Christ's kingdom which led him, in all his conscious power of leadership, to consult only the glory of God among men. But, from first to last, throughout his long life, Wesley was the autocrat of Methodism. His voice was law, his word authority. In British Methodism his scepter was supreme until, in extreme age, it dropped from a hand relaxed in death.

It may be said, certainly without disparagement to Mr. Wesley, that he personally enjoyed the exercise of this power. It is one of the richest luxuries that can ever come to a man to feel that he is providentially ordained to leadership in a great and good cause. The evidences seem to show that it was not from any intention on the part of Mr. Wesley that he lost his personal leadership of American Methodism. If he authorized the ordination of superintendents for America, he nevertheless intended that these should work under his authority and direction. It may, moreover, be conceded that there was a marked fitness in the unchallenged autoocracy of this great man. He was one of those great, exceptional men of whom God has only given a few

to the world. He combined in himself the powers which are usually distributed among many men. Methodism, in its organic life, was largely the creation of his own genius. It so largely centered in him, and emanated from him, that his unquestioned supremacy in its movements was accepted as a matter of manifest fitness. But Mr. Wesley's place in church history is as exceptional as it is pre-eminent. Dying, he left no successor. He made provision for the legal perpetuation of Methodism after his death, but it is well known to students of Methodist history that the period following the death of this great leader was, for years, one of anxious forebodings on the part of the most prominent men, preachers and laymen, in the British societies. It required the wisest statesmanship, and a large and loving spirit of brotherly concession, to adjust the denomination to its new conditions ; to properly distribute the powers of administration which hitherto had been in the hands of one man. Happily for British Methodism, men who were both great and good stood in their places with a wisdom equal to the emergency. The denomination, without impairment from fatal divisions, was preserved by the blessing of God on the wisdom of its preachers, to enter upon a still widening career of spiritual power and usefulness. But in British Methodism Mr. Wesley was the first and only autocrat.

In the development of American Methodism, singularly, but providentially, a man fit in many respects to be the compeer of Mr. Wesley was the leading spirit. If he is to be measured by his tireless labors, his ceaseless travels, his heroic sacrifices, all cheerfully borne for the sake of his Master's cause, then, doubtless, Francis Asbury is to be ranked as the most apostolic man in the American Church.

Mr. Asbury at first labored in America largely subject to Mr. Wesley's direction. Until the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church he, from manifest fitness of leadership, wielded much of the same power in America as Mr. Wesley did in England. When, then, in response to the request of the American societies, and under Wesley's authorization, Coke and Asbury were ordained superintendents, with the authority to ordain elders to administer the sacraments, it was an easy and quite natural process that the Methodist Episcopal Church in its earliest organization should confirm in the person of its

superintendents that authority of appointment which Mr. Asbury from the first had so judiciously exercised.

This was done at a time when the presence of Asbury was well-nigh ubiquitous among the societies; when, by his astonishing activity of superintendence, he had a more accurate knowledge personally of the preachers and their families, and of the state and needs of the societies, than perhaps it has been possible for any bishop since his day to have. If there was ever any justification in American Methodism for placing the supreme authority of ministerial appointment in episcopal hands, then certainly that justification had its vindication in the person of Bishop Asbury. He was *facile princeps*, a bishop by reason of his Pauline manhood. With a wisdom that seldom misjudged, with a piety ever aglow, with an energy that carried him like an eagle's flight, with a heroism that took on itself the heaviest burdens and the bitterest privations of that early itinerant life, with a heart always in sympathy with the struggles of his brethren—the great Asbury was approved, by the ordination of Heaven, a bishop on the front of whose miter there might also fittingly rest the badge of authority.

Yet, notwithstanding the pre-eminent fitness of Asbury for supremacy among his brethren, within his life-time the question of limiting the absolute power of the bishops in relation to the appointments became one of the most burning and anxious questions in American Methodism. This question became the essential occasion for the first great schism in the denomination. For several successive General Conferences, before and after the death of Asbury, it was most vigorously discussed by the ablest minds of the Church. It is a question which has often been kept in abeyance by others which, for the time, have required attention, but one the significance of which has never been lost sight of by the students of our denominational polity. The anomaly in the practical situation appears when it is remembered that in England, the land of monarchic rule and of hereditary aristocracy, the system of ministerial appointment practiced in Methodism since the death of Wesley has been as nearly democratic as it is possible to make it, while, during the same time, in this free republic, the vast power of appointment, involving stupendous interests, has been confided as a

sovereign authority to the hands of a few men. This question, as to whether the sovereign power of appointment resting with Methodist bishops is in harmony with the spirit of our age and country, whether one of mere sentiment or not, is at least large enough to suggest ground for sober reflection. If not vital, it is sufficiently singular and important to provoke study.

2. Another suggestion which is evoked by a study of episcopal authority is, that it is an authority not sufficiently guarded in behalf of the Church whose interests it so vitally affects.

This suggestion is not new. The general usage of the Church has been that, where persons have been placed in positions of great trust, the positions themselves shall not only be surrounded by ample safeguards, but their incumbents shall be under the scrutiny of authority, and shall be held to a close accountability for the faithful discharge of their trusts.

The decisions of bishops go to the very heart of family life; they touch the spiritual nerve-centers throughout the Church. Into relations that are most sensitive and sacred, upon work that is most vital to Christ's kingdom, the bishop projects his authority, and it is final. So far as law speaks, it says that in this present year one thousand Methodist ministers and their families must go to such fields of labor as one bishop alone has authority to decide for them, and that one thousand pastoral charges must receive such men, and only such, as he decides to send them. And there is provided in law no limitation, no safeguard, as against an unwise exercise of this vast power.\* If a bishop is guilty of immorality, of imprudent conduct, or of heresy, there is a way provided to bring him to trial. But if it should ever so happen that a man imperious and heartless should come to the bishop's chair, he would have power to make appointments which would go through men's souls like a pointed iron, and, under the present law, those aggrieved would have little or no power of redress. This is written with full knowledge of the law which says that a bishop is answerable for his conduct to the General Conference, and that complaints against his administration may be for-

\* It deserves to be noted that this Episcopal power is not independent but responsible, and subject to the will of a body composed of representatives of the parties over whom it is exercised. It cannot, therefore, be permanently perverted.—EDITOR.

warded to the same body. But the General Conference meets only once in four years, has a hurried session of less than a month, has other and absorbing business on hand, and makes no provision to defray the traveling expenses of a poor preacher who may think himself aggrieved at the hands of a bishop. The bishop, in the sphere of his appointing power, has practically no legal tribunal to fear. In those relations where his authority might work the greatest hardships there is, at best, only the most ghostly probability that he would ever be called to an official reckoning. A study of this question must make it clear that it would comport well with the usage of the Church in its other departments, that it would not detract from the essential dignity of the episcopal office, and that in the light even of theoretical possibilities it would be a reasonably prudent action so to revise existing rules as to bring the exercise of this most important function of the appointing power within clearly defined limits of responsibility.

3. Again, it would seem desirable, on many accounts, to so adjust the law of ministerial appointments as to cut the ground from under the feet of those who, unfriendly to Methodist polity, make existing law the ground for caustic and adverse criticisms of our system.

The writer, as a loyal student of Methodism, has been painfully interested in criticisms which, from time to time, he has been forced to hear from those who study our system for the purpose of attacking it.

Our critics sometimes undertake to impress us that it is in the very nature of our system to develop a spirit of tyranny in the bishops themselves. They say in substance :

The bishops are but men. It is certain that, for some reason, the episcopacy is regarded as a chief prize, which tempts the ambition of many in the ministry of the Church. It is abstractly possible that the election of bishops may, by and by, become largely a matter of Church politics. If such should ever be the case, then opportunity would be afforded for some man of towering personal ambition—a man adroit in the use of political methods—to so manipulate the forces in the field as to secure his own election to the high office of bishop. He has won his prize by processes which nobler, larger, and better men could never be tempted to adopt. He is a bishop. Whatever glamour the episcopal name may carry after he has invaded the office will henceforth attach to him. Wrapped in the robes of a life-office, bearing the badge of great authority,

can any one see why such a man is not likely somewhat unduly to magnify the importance of his personality? If ever smitten with a consciousness of his inferiority in the presence of brethren with whom he deals, would he not seek to fortify himself by a more ostentatious show of his authority?

Again they say:

The episcopal office as now constituted represents, beyond any reason in the nature of things, an officialism which may easily hold itself in lofty separation from the working ranks of the Church. Different from all other official stations in the ministry of Methodism, it gives to its incumbent a life-tenure of office. The office clothes its occupant with an authority which naturally appeals to the love of power. The office must be vested in a few men. And, as human nature is made up, these will be remarkable men indeed if they do not tenaciously and jealously guard and cherish all the prerogatives of their office. Evidence is not wanting that the great Wesley, to the end of his days, was characterized by a tenacious love of personal power. And in the early General Conferences of American Methodism, whenever the members, as it was clearly their right to do, discussed the desirability of limiting the episcopal authority, we have the not very edifying spectacle of the saintly Asbury either leaving the room or turning his back in grievous contempt upon the assembly. In presence of such examples, it is hardly reasonable to assume that men not their superiors will be less appreciative of the power of office, or less sensitive to encroachments upon what they may come to regard as their personal prerogatives.

The same class of critics, who think they see in the very nature of our system opportunities for such dangerous development of episcopal authority, are also quite certain that the system must produce correspondingly unhappy results upon the spirit of the ministry. They say:

If it is not good for the spirit of one set of men to be unduly exalted in power, it certainly is not better for the spirit of a larger number of men to feel that, in a very sensitive sense, they are the subjects of that power. Yet wherever there is a conscious dependence on power there is a tendency to be subservient to that power—a temptation to court and flatter its possessors. Abstractly, it could not be expected that the relations of preachers and churches to the authority of Methodist bishops would prove an exception to this rule.

To sustain this opinion they point to the fact that

As early in Methodist history as the O'Kelly controversy it was affirmed by the partisans of O'Kelly that the fear of Bishop Asbury's authority was sufficient to prevent many from express-

ing their real convictions. Is it not, therefore, unreasonable to assume that the ministry of the present stand in less subservient relations to episcopal power? The bishops hold a position of immense power. They can, if they so choose, do much to direct the legislation of the Church in harmony with their own views; they may use the wide opportunities of their position to influence the election of candidates to the high offices of the Church; they practically have the power to set up one man and to put down another. Now if the bishops upon the one hand possess such official authority and power in the Church, it can scarcely be otherwise than that, upon the other hand, there shall come to many in the ministry a temptation to flatter and to court this power in a spirit that shall be hurtful to their ministerial manhood.\*

Now, there are two facts which practically make nugatory these hostile strictures upon our system. The one is, the sanctified wisdom of our bishops; the other is, the self-respecting manhood of our ministry. These are facts which it is folly to leave out of the reckoning in any criticism aimed at our episcopal administration. The spirit of the criticisms above stated is grossly unjust to our bishops. It is gratuitous to say of the bishops that personally they are men of large experience and of great practical discernment. As men, they are fair-minded, brotherly, and devout. They can but recognize and respect the right of any man to discuss freely and fully any law of the Church. As administrators of discipline, it is the business of preachers to keep, and not to mend, the rules. But, while faithfully keeping the rules, it is an inalienable right belonging to every member in the Church, preacher and layman, to discuss and criticise its laws, and, if

\* Dr. Mains's résumé of the objections made to our polity by prejudiced observers reminds one of such books as *The Great Iron Wheel*, *A Century of Puritanism and a Century of its Opposites*, etc., which were freely circulated more than thirty years ago, but which were innocuous because in its practical working our Methodism did not sustain their charges against its polity. As Dr. Mains shows further on, the high character of its administrators and its splendid *esprit du corps* utilized its admirable working provisions without developing those injurious possibilities which, as many think, are contained in the principles of its polity. Of the expediency of the limitation to the authority of its chief administrators, once sought so earnestly by some of the noblest of our Church fathers, and now loyally contended for in the above article, and also by Dr. Porter, not long since, there will be different opinions. But its discussion, if temperately conducted, can do no harm. Whatever our enemies may say of Methodism, they cannot truthfully affirm that it shackles the speech of either its ministers or laymen. As in the State so in the Church, freedom of speech is both a conservative and a progressive force.—EDITOR.

he desires, to suggest measures for their revision and improvement. And no men more clearly know and recognize this right of all than the bishops of the Church. The Church has confided to the bishops an authority of which it would be a gross abuse for them to take any arbitrary advantage as against individuals for personal ends. The only thing that makes this great authority for a moment tolerable is, the constant assumption that the men who wield it will act in a most godly, unselfish, and paternal spirit. A disposition to lord it, a cold, self-seeking spirit, a mind chafed by personal animosities, incapable of rising above personal spites, a vision too narrow to take noble and loving views of men, an attitude of mind so self-confident or so indifferent as to seek the avoidance of the most patient investigation of all questions essential to just decisions—these, and like qualities, would be of all places most out of place in the chairs of the Methodist episcopacy. The great authority which the Church has conferred upon its bishops is committed to them as a trust to be most sacredly administered. In the spirit in which the Church confers this authority, and in which the person to be installed in the office agrees to receive it, there is no allowance for any thing but for its most godly exercise. In this view, a Methodist bishop who would consent to use his high place to promote purely selfish ends, or to lord it over his brethren, would be unfaithful to his high trust. But the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church have been as free from personal misuse of their authority as any set of men subjected to their exacting, difficult, and wearing duties could well be. They have not been untrue to their sacred obligations in the past; they are not likely to prove untrue in the future. But if they should in the future make unjustifiable use of their authority, then, such is the free spirit of the Church, that authority, like a sea-wave, would dash itself to pieces against the resisting manhood of the ministry and the Church.

Practically, therefore, there is little danger to be feared in Methodism from a tyrannical episcopacy, upon the one hand, or from a servile ministry upon the other hand. But, nevertheless, the letter of Methodist law seems, on the one side, to place such unlimited authority in the hands of a few, while it leaves the many subject to this authority, that, studied in its naked

letter, it furnishes plausible grounds for these theoretical strictures of our enemies, although, as shown, the spirit in which it is administered may be worthy of all commendation. These points being conceded, the writer may now be permitted to state one of the most practically urgent reasons for an early and wise modification of this law.

4. The law regulating the authority of appointments in Methodism might be so adjusted as to cause this authority to emanate more directly from, and to be more closely amenable to, the ministry and the people whose interests are so greatly affected by its exercise.

So far as the ministry is concerned, the time has come when its rank and file should have a direct voice in deciding concerning its commanders in the field. The statesmen of the Church, who would project wise plans for the future growth and strength of the denomination, will act wisely if they are studiously careful to devise means which shall bring the masses of our people—both ministry and laity—into more direct and causative relations to the central machinery of the system. In the growth of the Methodist Episcopal Church its centralization of authority becomes more and more manifest. The General Conference, meeting but once in four years, is the only law-making council of the Church. But the growth of the Church and the representatives in this council have stood in a somewhat inverse relation to each other—the ratio of representatives growing relatively less with the increase of the Church.

The General Conference, on the present basis of representation, is thought by many to be an unwieldy body, and there is a pressure to still further lessen the ratio of representation to its membership. Thus our very denominational growth tends more and more to disfranchise the working ranks of the ministry and laity from participation in the law-making functions of the Church. Practically, even now, the great body of working ministers in Methodism is not much represented in the authority conferring counsels of the denomination. And this is a grave matter. The strength of Methodism is, and always must be, largely in its traveling ministry. The men who have pioneered its successes over pathways of hardship, and through wildernesses of difficulty—who have conceived its great ag-

gressive plans, and who have organized and inspired its forces with zeal and courage for the achievement of those plans—these are the men who stand and have stood in the ranks of the itinerant ministry. These are the men who must be relied upon for the most useful leadership of the future. It is God's ordination ; the ministry is divinely commissioned to marshal and to lead the Church to the conquest of the world.

But who shall plead the wisdom of that system which tells these men, divinely called to transform the face of the world, that they shall have little or no voice in deciding as to the human authorities that shall direct their labors ? Such a system is wrong ; it needs correction. Heroes, of whom every man is himself a leader, have a natural right to decide as to whom they shall crown with chieftainship over themselves.

To devise some wisely practicable method by which the members of the Annual Conferences should have a direct vote in electing those who, in turn, should have a decisive voice in making the appointments, would be to render immensely valuable service to the denomination.

5. A final objection which the writer urges against the present law of the episcopal appointing authority is that, as a law standing by itself, it is clearly impracticable.

In proof of this position but a single statement is needed. The present membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church approaches two millions. This vast membership is distributed through many thousands of societies, and over all the lands of the earth. This membership is served by twelve thousand conference ministers, to say nothing about an equal or a larger number of local preachers. Every Society and every Conference preacher in this great Connection is subject to an annual appointment, and they whose authority and duty alone it is to make appointments for all these are, at present, eleven men. To illustrate what is assigned to these men, suppose the following case : A Western bishop comes to one of the New York Conferences. He cannot at most stay more than a fortnight within the territory of the Conference. He is necessarily a stranger. He has never personally seen one in twenty of the churches to be served ; he cannot even name from personal acquaintance one in six of the members of the Conference. And yet the law makes it the duty of this stranger, and of him

solely, to appoint, within the brief space at his command, more than two hundred ministers to as many churches for the doing of God's most important work in the world. Now, whatever the letter of Methodist law says, common sense says that no man has yet been born who has the ability, under such conditions, properly to discharge such a task.

If, now, it should be replied that, whatever the letter of the law may call for, the usage of the Church so comes to the relief of the appointing power as to enable it to do its work, upon the whole, quite wisely, to this it only needs to be said that the factor of usage has thus far been purposely omitted from this discussion.

It has been the purpose of this paper to deal mainly with the law of the episcopal appointing power as it stands on the books, and its plea is that the letter of this law should not only be so changed as to make it conform to usage, but that it shall be so worded as to create a usage that shall harmonize more perfectly than the usage of the present with the fundamental law of the Church.

III. The plan here to be suggested to secure the needed changes is not novel. It is one which the wisdom of the fathers wrought out at a time when its provisions were not so needful as now. It is a plan which, after thorough discussion, was once adopted by more than a two-thirds vote of a General Conference. The plan from that moment ought to have remained an unquestioned embodiment in our church law. But at the dictation of one man, who had just been elected to the episcopacy and who declared his purpose not to serve under this law, that General Conference, for the sake of peace, allowed this plan to be suspended, and eight years later, for reasons which did not affect its merits, the plan was rescinded.

The plan then proposed was as follows:

1. That whenever in any Annual Conference there shall be a vacancy or vacancies in the office of presiding elder, in consequence of his period of service of four years having expired, or the bishop wishing to remove any presiding elder, or by death, resignation, or otherwise, the bishop or president of the Conference, having ascertained the number wanted from any of these causes, shall nominate three times the number, out of which the Conference shall elect by ballot without debate the number wanted; *provided*, when there is more than one wanted not more than three at a

time shall be nominated, nor more than one at a time elected; *provided*, also, that in case of any vacancy or vacancies in the office of presiding elder in the interval of any Annual Conference the bishop shall have authority to fill the said vacancy or vacancies until the ensuing Annual Conference.

2. That the presiding elders be and are hereby made the advisory council of the bishop or president of the Conference in stationing the preachers.

The writer's understanding of the second part of this plan is, that it confers upon the presiding elders authority, in the sense that no appointment could be confirmed without, at least, a majority vote of the bishop and his council. The adoption of this plan would result in many and great advantages. Note a few of them.

1. While leaving with the episcopacy a proper measure of authority, it would also confer a rightful dignity and authority upon the presiding eldership.

It has long been conceded that the bishops are absolutely dependent for the wise discharge of their functions in making the appointments upon the knowledge and advice of the presiding elders. The bishops themselves freely admit this. It is the duty of the presiding elders, as of no other persons, to inspect the conditions and needs of the churches, and to know the characters and wants of the preachers, and, in the nature of their work, they are the only men in the Conference who from a knowledge of the entire field are competent to give wise advice for all the work of appointment-making. The bishop is necessarily dependent upon their counsel; and, as a matter of fact, a great majority of all the preachers and churches in the Conference rely upon them to arrange their appointments. This is in usage perhaps their most important function. Yet this is the very function for the discharge of which they have not one syllable of authority in law. They may arrange with the most prayerful and studious care for a wise adjustment of all the Conference appointments, and the bishop, with not a tithe of their knowledge of the situation, has authority to undo all their work, and to ignore their counsels. In case of episcopal readjustments that disappoint both churches and preachers, as in the nature of things they sometimes must, the bishop, after reading the appointments, disappears from the scene, while the presiding elders, who are without power in the matter, are

left on the ground to face the censures of both the disappointed parties.

Now, this position of the presiding elders is not only most anomalous, it is humiliating. Either the presiding elders ought to be excused from all responsibility in making the appointments, or else they ought to have authority commensurate with their responsibility. The system as it is now worked not only places these officers in humiliating relations, but it carries distrust and weakness into its own movements. Many of the larger churches, knowing how little familiar the bishop is with their needs, do not trust him to arrange for their appointments; knowing the helplessness of the presiding elders, they will not trust the matter to them; and so they proceed, oftentimes at disadvantage and with poor results to themselves, independently to make their own arrangements. The effect of this practice upon the weaker churches, which are wanting in power to make influential demands upon the appointing authority, is often to breed in them both distrust and discouragement. The disposition of churches to prearrange for their pastors may not in itself be a bad thing, but its increasing prevalence, especially in the older Conferences, shows that the appointing authority is not trusted by the churches as it once was.

Let this plan of the fathers be adopted, and the presiding elders will not only be clothed with an authority which shall attach a just responsibility to their work, but the distribution of the appointing authority will be such as to inspire confidence among both churches and preachers that the appointments will be wisely made.

2. The plan proposed calls for an Annual Conference autonomy that falls with beautiful harmony into the general constitution of the Church. The bishops are general, not local, superintendents. They are elected by the General Conference, the body representing the entire Church. But the presiding elders, under this plan, would be local superintendents, their jurisdiction being confined to the Conferences which they represent. Within their own Conferences, in the matter of appointment-making, they would be jointly responsible with the presiding bishop. Is it not as manifestly fit for the Annual Conferences to elect their own local superintendents as for the General Conference to elect the general superintendents of the

Church? Within every Annual Conference there are men who, from their intimate knowledge of local needs, are more competent wisely to adjust ministerial appointments than any general superintendent in the nature of the case can be. The working ministers of the Church would feel, under this plan, that their interests are authoritatively handled by men whom they had a decisive voice in making their chiefs in office. The concession by the General Conference of this kind of suffrage to the Annual Conferences would be a dignified act; it would be a wise bestowment of authority where it properly belongs.

This plan would not encroach upon the proper dignities of the episcopal office. If, in some such sense as the members of his cabinet are the advisers of the president of the nation, the presiding elders are to be regarded as the bishop's advisers, the bishop still has the right of nomination. The Constitution of the United States gives to the president the right to nominate the various members of his cabinet, because it concedes the propriety of his having advisers in these close relations who shall be congenial to himself. But inasmuch as these men have to deal with important interests of the people, the Constitution also provides that these nominations may be confirmed or rejected by the Senate. That an Annual Conference ought to have the right at least to confirm or reject the nominations of the bishop for presiding elders is manifest, when it is remembered that the presiding elders deal with the interests of the Conference. They are, and ought to be, much more the representatives of the Conference than of the bishop.

If any should insist that this plan would detract from episcopal dignity, it must still be easy to see that any loss in this direction would be much more than compensated by the just dignity that it would confer upon the presiding elders, and upon all the Annual Conferences.

3. Finally, the adoption of this plan would furnish the occasion for the introduction of a useful lay representation into the Annual Conference. The formation of the districts as well as the appointments of preachers ought to be decided by a vote of the bishop's council. The formation of districts and the appointment of preachers are both matters of grave importance to the laity. It might prove both just and reasonable that a wisely regulated lay delegation should have a joint-voice with

the members of the Conference in the election of the presiding elders.

The movement which secured lay representation in the General Conference was in the right direction. But this result only partially meets the needs of the Church. A movement that would vastly more serve the denomination is one that will secure a wisely-adjusted lay representation in all the Annual Conferences. The people ought to be more and more the authority-conferring power in the Church. The political education of the American people is in this direction. The American Church that will hold the people in the future is the Church that will preach the doctrines of Methodism, while, at the same time, the suffrage which shall control its legislation and direct its practical work is most liberally vested in its membership. The real strength of the nation is in the patriotism of its citizens. But citizenship is a condition to patriotism.

A thing which Methodism needs now to do is to inspire into the heart of its great membership a spirit of denominational patriotism. One certain way of doing this is to invest our members with a larger Church citizenship. Let every youth who comes into the membership of the Church feel that he may become a direct factor in influencing the law and life of its movements, and we shall have a generation of Methodist laymen who will be intelligent students of their denominational polity, who will feel a patriotic love for the Church of which they are the guardians, and who may be relied upon, by their generous gifts and their consecrated labors, to give to Methodism a foremost place in Christ's kingdom upon the earth.

The plan proposed is one that harmonizes well with the fundamental law of the Church; it is, doubtless, constitutional. It is historic, and has the merit of simplicity. If it were conceded, the machinery is at hand for its prompt working.

It will be easily within the power of the next General Conference to adopt this plan as the law of the Church. If adopted, we believe it would be greatly promotive of an era of prosperity and power such as hitherto has had no parallel in Methodist history.

GEORGE P. MAINS.

## ART. VI.—FOREIGN EPISCOPAL RESIDENCES.

ONE of the most important questions to come before the next General Conference is that of episcopal residences in foreign lands. The subject was introduced into the last General Conference on the fourth day of the session by a resolution prepared and presented by the author of this paper, requesting the Committee on Episcopacy "to carefully consider and report upon the desirability of having two of the bishops assigned to reside in foreign fields." As stated at the time, this resolution was the fruit of the independent thought of its mover. As a somewhat careful student of the missionary work and methods of our Church, he had come to believe that the time was at hand when those methods should be so modified that the episcopacy should be really and practically identified with the foreign work, and given such an opportunity for leadership in that work as they have in the home work. He had accordingly been led to think it desirable that, even as episcopal residences had been placed in San Francisco and Atlanta, and other cities in different portions of our vast national domain, so episcopal residences ought to be placed in at least two of our foreign fields; one in India and one in Europe. Before introducing his resolution he had very briefly conferred with two or three of the most prominent foreign missionaries who were members of the body, and had found them both surprised and gratified at his intention to bring the subject forward. They felt it very important that the step called for should be taken, although they had no Conference resolution or memorial to present. They afterward supported the proposition most weightily, both in committee and on the floor of the General Conference. But it did not originate with them, and they had no personal interest to subserve in supporting it. They were actuated only by their supreme desire for the greatest possible success of our Church in its foreign work.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Missions, where, after a strong discussion, favorable action was taken, the placing of an episcopal residence in India being recommended by a vote of 57 to 2, and that of an episcopal residence in Europe by a vote of 50 to 7. In view of the fact that there

had been no previous canvassing of the subject this large majority was both surprising and significant. These recommendations, embodied in separate reports, were by the General Conference referred to the Committee on Episcopacy. That Committee, by a large majority, subsequently recommended the placing of an episcopal residence in India, the Committee on Judiciary having previously reported its opinion "that the General Conference has power to fix the residence of any of its bishops in any part of the territory occupied by the Methodist Episcopal Church." The debate on the general question was a very able one, lasting several days. The bishops were asked for their opinion, and replied "that it would not be wise at the present time to fix episcopal residences in Europe, India, and Africa, nor in any one of them." When the General Conference finally came to a vote on the report recommending the placing of an episcopal residence in India, a separate vote of the two houses being called for by more than one third of the laymen present, 144 ministerial delegates voted in favor of the proposition and 110 against it. The lay vote was 59 in favor and 81 against. The report accordingly failed of adoption for the want of a concurrent vote, though supported by a majority of the total number of votes. Among those who voted affirmatively were four out of the five who were subsequently elected bishops; namely, W. X. Ninde, W. F. Mallaliu, J. M. Walden, and William Taylor—the latter, of course, voting as a layman. By all parties the question was regarded as one of the greatest importance. Dr. Lanahan called it "the weightiest and most important question that ever came before the General Conference." Dr. Curry agreed "with Dr. Lanahan that this subject, if not the greatest that ever came before the General Conference, yet is one of the very great ones." Others, on both sides of the question, used language equally strong concerning it. One leading point pressed by the opposition was that the movement was premature.

The agitation of the question was certainly not generally anticipated, and it had not been discussed in the Church periodicals. Yet it had only to be presented to enlist the earnest attention of every member of the body. And in the course of its consideration certain facts were made clear, namely; that the representative foreign missionaries of the Church were

unanimous in believing it of essential importance that episcopal residences for general superintendents should be fixed in India and in Europe ; that, although no memorial had been presented from India, the subject had been very thoroughly considered by the membership of both our Conferences there, and it was their desire that they should be given a resident bishop ; that both at home and abroad the Church looks to the episcopacy for leadership as well as administration ; that the dimensions of our foreign work had become such that the old methods of management must soon be superseded either by missionary bishops or local autonomy if not by the plan proposed ; that the plan of establishing foreign episcopal residences was entirely in harmony with the Discipline, and was favored by a majority of the members of the body and by a large majority of the clerical delegates, embracing many of the ablest, most distinguished, and most conservative men of the denomination. No measure of any considerable importance ever before received such favorable and thoughtful consideration by a General Conference without having been previously discussed extensively in print.

From these facts it may be inferred that the question was not finally settled, though the plan was for the time defeated. The future, the near future, will have to choose between the plan of foreign episcopal residence and some radical change. The placing of episcopal residences in foreign lands is not a radical change. It is the only one which is respectful to the episcopacy and conservative of the unity of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The question will be brought before the next General Conference by the representatives of our foreign fields. There will then be no ground for saying that its presentation is premature. It may yet be seen that it was not premature in 1884.

There are certain considerations in favor of the plan of fixing foreign episcopal residences that have much weight :

1. The fixing of episcopal residences in foreign lands is demanded by the theory that underlies the fixing of episcopal residences in different portions of our own land.

A fair sample of the discussion which preceded the fixing of episcopal residences first by the General Conference of 1872 is found in the following extract from an article on "Method-

ism : Its Method and Mission," by Dr. Jesse T. Peck, afterward bishop, in the *Methodist Review* for April, 1869 :

Let the idea of a ubiquitous "general itinerant superintendency" be fully realized. This does not require a large increase of the number of bishops, which for economical and connectional reasons will generally be admitted to be inexpedient; nor diocesan episcopacy, which would destroy our itinerancy. Let our episcopacy remain in jurisdictional authority entirely indivisible, as though it were one universal bishop. The genius of our church polity requires it, and there is absolutely no other way of realizing administrative unity in unlimited extension.

There is, however, a power for good, partly personal and partly of office, which appertains to the episcopal presence and labors, which ought to be fairly distributed, and which, like all other pastoral functions, absolutely demands assignable limits for its most effective application. This is inevitably localized, and its area largely determined by the residence of the bishop. Let, then, the General Conference divide our whole territory into as many districts as there are effective bishops, and direct that one shall reside in each district, to exchange within a prescribed period, leaving jurisdiction and the distribution of administrative labor precisely as they now are.

The General Conference of 1872 recognized the truth here happily stated, that there is "a power for good, partly personal and partly of office, which appertains to the episcopal presence and labors, which *ought to be fairly distributed*." It also acted on the theory that that power has "*its area largely determined by the residence of the bishop*." It wisely did not try to set limits to the local influence of a bishop, but it fixed episcopal residences for the newly-elected bishops, recommending that they should select their respective residences from the eight designated places in the order in which they were elected. An effort was made to distribute the episcopal residences fairly throughout the work in America. There was no requirement that an exchange of residences should be made after a term of years. The action of subsequent General Conferences has been similar.

The demand for foreign episcopal residences is simply a demand that the principle be applied to "*our whole territory*." No one doubts that there has been greater energy and greater growth in the younger portions of our work on account of the great local influence of the resident bishop. To preside at and have jurisdiction over Conferences are but portions of the real

work of a Methodist bishop, and all his work, however much there be of it, and however well it be done, does not account for the sum total of his influence. In the bishops we see the representatives of the whole Church. They are aggrandized by imagination and sentiment, and the addition to their personal power thus gained is not only real but vast. The sight of a bishop is often worth more to a great occasion than the eloquence of an orator. The value of the visit of a bishop to any section cannot be graduated by his gifts or his activity. He is the visible embodiment of the unity and grandeur of a great denomination, with its heroic and wonderful past, and its limitless possibilities for the future. His residence in any given portion of the territory of the Church, even when his general duties call him to other and distant fields for much of the time, not only gives that locality the benefit of his counsel, his enthusiasm, his leadership, and the chief place in his affections, but also strengthens it with the aggregated prestige of the whole denomination. All those elements of a bishop's power and influence are especially needed in the new and difficult portions of our vast field, and are needed most of all in our work in foreign lands. The special interest of a bishop in a certain portion of our territory does not interfere with his interest in the Church as a whole, or his activity and efficiency as a general superintendent.

The Methodist Episcopal Church is ecumenical now, whatever it may be in the future. The fact that our foreign work has been visited regularly by our bishops illustrates the fact that our Church is the same in Europe and Asia as in America, the same in India or China as in Colorado or California. The fixing of episcopal residences in the new and more distant sections of our American work shows that the personal and official power of a resident bishop is regarded as of great importance where leadership is especially demanded, where difficult questions have to be often considered, and where the foundations have to be laid for the great educational and religious development of the future. All will concede that these conditions are especially characteristic of our foreign fields. Why not, then, give the continents of Asia and Europe at least one resident bishop? There is nothing against it in the law of the Church. To do so would be in harmony with the policy which has been

pursued since 1872. Not to do so is discordant with that policy. But it has been said that to fix an episcopal residence in India would be equivalent to making a diocesan bishop of the general superintendent sent to reside there. This notion is obviously mistaken, not to say absurd, and yet it will do no harm to exhibit its fallacy:

1.) A general superintendent residing in India, and spending most of his time there, could biennially at least visit Conferences in China and Japan, and once in a quadrennium be assigned to visit the European Conferences and a number of Conferences in America. And once in a quadrennium another of our general superintendents could be sent to preside at the Conferences in India.

2.) The history of the past would indicate that neither a bishop's long residence in a certain locality, nor his continued presidency over the same Conference, nor his continued supervision over the same Conference, is inconsistent with the general superintendency. Certainly, protracted residence in one section or one city does not make a bishop any the less a general superintendent. Most of the bishops may reside in the same city during the whole period of their effective service, if they so desire. Many of our bishops have continued in the same place of residence for many years, and have been in toil and travel eminent among our general superintendents. Continued or repeated presidency over the same Conference has been considered not inconsistent with the plan of our itinerant general superintendency. Bishop Hedding presided over the New England Conference for eleven successive years. During recent years there have been many instances of one bishop's presiding at a certain Conference two successive years. Bishop Foster presided at the East Maine Conference in 1876, 1879, and 1880—three times in five years. He would have been welcomed heartily if he had done so during five successive years, and would not have been thereby disqualified for or hindered in his duties as a general superintendent. The fact that a bishop has presided at a certain Conference is often a good reason why he should go there again, and has been recognized as such. The same bishop usually presides over the European Conferences during two years in succession. Long-continued episcopal supervision of the same field by the same bishop has

not been regarded as inconsistent with the general superintendency. Bishop Harris had episcopal supervision over India from 1874 till his decease.

3.) The itinerant general superintendency does not require that any one bishop should travel through the whole territory of the Church. Bishop Ames was never sent to any portion of our foreign field, and the General Conference found no fault with his being limited to America during the whole of his long term of episcopal service. If a bishop may be limited to America by his own choice and the assignment of the Board of Bishops for many years or for his life-time, even after the foreign work of the Church has become vastly extended, and yet be a general superintendent, he might both reside and be assigned by the bishops to work in Asia for a term of years and yet not become diocesan. A diocesan bishop is one the boundaries of whose district are defined by the General Conference, and whose jurisdiction is limited to his district by the General Conference, so that no assignment of labor can be made for him by the Board of Bishops. A missionary bishop, as defined by the amended third restrictive rule, is really a diocesan bishop. He is equal in rank to the other bishops. By the same form of consecration he has been set apart for life for the office of a bishop in the Church of God. But the limits of his episcopal work and jurisdiction are fixed by the General Conference. The other bishops cannot in any way interfere with him, nor can he have any part in assigning them to their work from year to year. When a missionary or diocesan bishop is shut into any territory the other bishops are shut out of it. But no such consequences follow the fixing of an episcopal residence.

2. The need of a resident general superintendent has been strongly expressed by our ministers and missionaries in foreign fields, and especially in India. No men more vividly realize the unity of Episcopal Methodism than those who have built up our foreign work. They desire to be in the fullest sense identified with the Church. It is natural that they should thus desire. The genius of Episcopal Methodism is such that wherever it makes a new conquest the new class, the new society, the new mission, the new district, the new Conference, is vitally, and not simply formally, linked to the main body; the

new sprout, twig, or branch is an outgrowth of the tree. It has been well said by one of the ablest of our missionaries :

The missionaries cannot safely assume that their converts are so many children, nor, on the other hand, can missionary authorities in England or America commit the more serious mistake of supposing that foreign missions must have their ecclesiastical affairs administered by parties on the other side of the globe. In every living Church there are laws of growth as natural and yet as inseparable from life itself as the corresponding laws which we see in plants and trees; and we must assume that the development of every little Church and of every Christian community will go on according to fixed laws, the development being from within and not from without. Hence, I have long been of the opinion that the whole machinery of ecclesiastical administration ought to be present in every mission field.\*

This is true of every denomination, but it is a truth of far greater importance in the Methodist Episcopal Church than in any other. The connectional bond is especially represented by the episcopacy of the general superintendents. The presiding eldership is a limited episcopacy, but it covers no broader unity than that of the district. The episcopacy represents the unity of the whole Church. The need of resident bishops has for years been felt by our leading missionaries. The testimony from foreign fields is, that the time has fully come when episcopal residence there is imperatively needed. The loftiest representatives of the unity of the Church can best bind the new fields with unity. A visiting bishop, however able, however sympathetic, however careful and laborious, cannot afford the local leadership of which there is pressing need. This was the concurrent testimony of the representatives of Europe, Asia, and Africa in the General Conference of 1884. When there is no resident bishop on a whole continent the personal influence of the episcopacy can be comparatively little felt; the local leadership will certainly not be episcopal. In the discussion at the last General Conference Ram Chandra Bose said :

There are about 8,000 Methodists in India in connection with our two Conferences, and of these about 50 per cent., or 4,000, do not know the difference between a presiding elder and a bishop; or whether a bishop is a huge animal like the elephant, or a funny little thing like the mouse. Of the remaining 4,000, nine-tenths have not bestowed a moment's thought on the subject.

\* J. M. Thoburn, *Missionary Addresses*.

Unlike our great missionaries in that land, he was well content to have this state of things continue; but, if his statement was correct, it is certain that the biennial visits of the bishops have not made any great impression on the native membership.

The Rev. Dennis Osborne, of the South India Conference, in the course of a most eloquent appeal for the placing of an episcopal residence in India, said:

I have heard said, and before this General Conference, that which has given me the impression that our bishops are not appreciated in America. Now in India we do not have that sentiment. I have heard a brother here say, that in such and such a Conference a bishop had not been seen for so many years, and I am amazed. But in India we have this opinion: that a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church is a leader though he is not able to speak the language of the country. He may not be able when he comes from here, but he will be a man of good judgment and will stand by his brethren and the work, and though he may have to be interpreted to the natives, he is able to be of service to them in their language, and able to address masses of educated natives in the English language.

We want a leader. There is a vast country before us, Mr. President, and when I think of the needs of the land, when I think of that which the Lord has accomplished by the instrumentality of these two Conferences, and especially through the instrumentality of the North India Conference, and when I think of the great territory already obtained, I can but give utterance to the thought that we need a bishop there. . . . When I was coming to America I took pains to get testimony. I circulated a paper, and the unanimous testimony of brethren was this: We are a unit on this question. We feel that there is need of peculiar, constant, and extended episcopal supervision in India. We shall welcome it as a much-needed good. This is the sentiment of our Conference on the subject. And now the cry has come from India.

Said that veteran, the Rev. E. W. Parker:

This is, indeed, a new step. I have studied it for twelve years, and it has grown upon me that a bishop in India could do us a great deal of good. Look at the land—1,900 miles long by 1,500 miles wide. Just consider the field of India as if it were the United States east of the Mississippi River! and then consider that that land is dotted with twice as many cities as you have east of the Mississippi River. We have occupied every one of these cities as centers. Now that is our field—250,000,000 of people, covering a territory as large as the United States east of the Mississippi River, with large cities, centers of population

and centers of work—and we have occupied them all—from which we work out into the regions beyond. In that field we have all classes of people and twenty different languages spoken. Consider, also, the different forms of government in different parts of the different provinces. This is our field as it is laid out.

Now, having occupied this field in these great centers, we are separated from each other. None of these missionaries generally live within fifty miles of each other. Our districts are far separated. Our districts, except two, will be 250 miles from each other, and the centers of our districts will be 1,000 miles from each other. *There is no connectional tie in the whole country; no connectional bond.* There is no connectional tie between those districts connected with the whole of our work in India. Now, being scattered in that way, we believe that a bishop will become to us a connectional tie, would come to be a natural leader to direct every thing in proper channels. There are differences and great questions to be settled. One bishop said to me, "Brother Parker, there is no other Conference in the Connection that has so many difficult questions to settle as you have," and on many of these questions he said, "You know so much about them all, take the responsibility of deciding." Now, these being facts, we feel that a leader coming to live with us and coming to know our people would be prepared to help us in the work.

These statements make it clear that India has not had episcopal supervision in the full sense of that term, and in the nature of the case cannot have it till a bishop goes there to reside. Supervision from New York, however thoughtful, devoted, and able, is not the unifying influence, the personal leadership, that is demanded by the interests of the work. No supervision from New York could be wiser, more interested, or more enterprising than that of Bishop Harris. A leader who shall have his home on the soil of India is needed. There are now three Annual Conferences in India. No bishop resident in America can, during the brief period of a biennial visitation, "travel at large" through the vast territory covered by these Conferences so as to become personally a leader in the sense in which Bishop Foss is a leader in the North-west, Bishop Fowler on the Pacific slope, and Bishop Mallalieu in the South. Under the provision made by the last General Conference for the organization of Central Mission Conferences in any of our foreign fields where there is more than one Annual Conference or inission, or more than one form of Methodism, a Central Conference has been duly organized in India. That Central Con-

ference of India has adopted the following memorial to the next General Conference:

While we fully appreciate and are profoundly grateful for the amount of supervision our beloved bishops have been able to give us since the first visit of the sainted Bishop Thomson, in 1864, when our first Conference was organized, until the coming of our latest Bishop Ninde, who has given so much time and has been able so carefully and thoroughly to look into our work in all its branches, north and south, east and west, still we are convinced that the time has now come when, for the most efficient working of our system of Methodism in India, we need much more than a brief biennial visitation; therefore,

*Resolved*, That we most earnestly and respectfully memorialize the approaching General Conference to so plan and arrange the work of episcopal supervision throughout the entire Church that a bishop may come to India as a general superintendent residing in India.

No petition could be more reasonable than this. It is the united appeal of the whole of our Church in India. The representatives of our European Conferences were a unit on this question in 1884. They were all earnest in the desire that Europe might be granted a resident bishop, to be a personal bond between all the sections of our work from the North Cape to Naples. The first request of the delegate from the Liberia Conference was, that a general superintendent be sent to reside in Africa. The foreign fields themselves consider this question of the highest and most immediate importance. Their desire for resident general superintendents is not only the expression of an urgent sense of need of episcopal leadership, but also an evidence of the thoroughness of their love for the Church, and their high appreciation of its most characteristic institutions. Their view of the matter ought to be decisive, being altogether in harmony with the law of the Church.

3. Progress on this line is the true conservatism. It may be assumed that something will be done by the next General Conference to improve the methods of administration of the foreign work. No plan could be more wisely conservative than to respond to the needs and appeals of the foreign fields by giving them the full influence and help of the episcopacy, as we do to the different sections of the home field. The alternative would be the election of a missionary bishop for India, and other missionary bishops for other foreign fields.

Now, although the amended third restrictive rule permits the election of missionary bishops whose jurisdiction is limited to the missions for which they are appointed, yet the placing of our foreign fields under the administration of bishops thus limited in jurisdiction is open to some very grave objections:

1.) The connectional tie is impaired. The foreign field which is under the jurisdiction of a missionary bishop is no longer under the jurisdiction of the united episcopacy.

2.) The foreign work is not all in the missions. Much of the work in India is self-supporting; and the new work developed under Bishop Taylor in Africa is of the same character. The adjective "missionary" is certainly not felicitous when applied to a bishop whose jurisdiction includes much self-supporting work, especially if he desires to encourage the principle of self-support.

3.) A missionary bishop is in fact a diocesan bishop. In rank he is not inferior to the other bishops; and if he has not jurisdiction in their fields, neither have they in his. His work is certainly not inferior to theirs. It is not characteristic of the genius of Methodism to regard pioneer and heroic work as inferior. If our foreign territory be split up among diocesan bishops, then we shall have gone a long way toward the future splitting up of the home work in the same manner.

4.) Happily the sentiment of the Church is healthily and enthusiastically devoted to the general superintendency, and healthily opposed to the limiting of any bishop's jurisdiction, even to a continent. By a most remarkable and sudden wave of feeling, the last General Conference, after side-tracking the proposition of an episcopal residence in Africa, elected William Taylor missionary bishop for Africa. Nothing can be more certain than that the framers of the amendment to the third restrictive rule, enacted in 1856, providing for the election of missionary bishops, never had any anticipation that under that provision such a world-wide itinerant as William Taylor would be tied down to one continent. William Taylor is at present really a diocesan bishop. His episcopal jurisdiction is limited to Africa. The sentiment of the Church would enthusiastically approve the taking off of the limitation of his episcopal jurisdiction. If he were to spend only six months in a quadrennium in America, he would arrange to "travel at large" very

extensively in the home work. It is not William Taylor, but the Church, that suffers loss while any limitation rests upon the exercise of his office. Of all our bishops, could any other make as influential an episcopal tour in India as he?

Let it not be thought that the election of diocesan bishops for the foreign work would be void of influence on the work in America. Diocesan bishops are at present not favored by the great body of the Church for either the foreign or the home field. But if the plan of diocesan bishops for the foreign field becomes popular and prevalent, there will be a steady drift in the same direction here at home. There is a fundamental and immeasurable difference between the placing of episcopal residences here or there and the drawing of the lines of episcopal districts. When we put diocesan bishops in the foreign fields we limit the general superintendency to America; and when we get started on the policy of limiting and dividing the episcopacy it is not easy to tell where we will stop. Can a missionary bishop be moved from one field to another by the General Conference at the end of a quadrennium? Doubtless he can, for to change the field, the district, of a bishop whose jurisdiction is limited is not contrary to the third restrictive rule. If the General Conference should get a taste of the pleasure of making appointments for bishops, it might like to go into the business on a large scale. There are many who would like to have the home territory divided into episcopal districts, and the bishops appointed to them for four years respectively. If we pursue the diocesan plan in the foreign fields we immediately impair the sphere of the unity and power of the general superintendency, and we may end by destroying it.

The placing of episcopal residences for general superintendents in our great foreign fields is the reverse of radical or revolutionary. It limits no bishop's jurisdiction. It protects every interest involved and endangers none. It is conservative of the unity of the Methodist episcopacy at home as well as abroad. It will tend to increase the hold of the general superintendency on the admiration and the heart of the Church. That this has been the effect of the distribution of episcopal residences throughout the different portions of the United States all will acknowledge. Our foreign work is too

much regarded as an ornamental charity. When we become fully in earnest for the world's conversion there will be no need of urging the propriety and importance of the residence of bishops in foreign fields. A general superintendent's residence in India would be worth more to the success of our Church there than the doubling of the appropriations for our mission in that land. Moreover, episcopal leadership in the foreign fields would increase, as nothing else could, the enthusiasm of the home churches in the missionary cause and their contributions for it. Let us see a great missionary and a great bishop in one person, and wherever he moves, whether in India, or Africa, or Europe, or America, his influence on the evangelistic zeal of the Church will be inspiring in the highest degree.

The time will come when the Methodist Episcopal Church in one foreign country after another will seek for local autonomy. That time has not yet come, and there are no signs of its near approach. The Methodist Episcopal form of church government is the best adapted to the work of evangelization of any that the world has yet seen. It is at once the firmest and the most flexible, the best centralized and the most diffusive; it is an ecclesiastical perpetual motion, and the spirit of life is in the wheels. Our foreign conferences are loyal to that system. They ask for the fullest and most intimate episcopal supervision. They are an integral part of the Church, and claim the full measure of its privileges. They expect to be affiliated with us as Episcopal Methodists after India and China and Africa shall have each its own General Conference. The whole world is not as wide now as the American Continent was fifty years ago. Let us cling to our general superintendency. Let us continue on the line of putting the residences of our general superintendents where they are most needed, whether at home or abroad. Let us beware of limiting the jurisdiction of Methodist bishops by territorial lines, even though they be the shores of a continent. The unity and omnipresence of the general superintendency are both essential to the integrity of our system. Preserve the general superintendency unimpaired, and the world is our parish; and in every great division of that parish let us place the homes of the great leaders of our triumphant corps of Immanuel's army.

J. E. C. SAWYER.

## EDITORIAL MISCELLANY.

• • •  
CURRENT TOPICS.

## ETHICS AND ÆSTHETICS.

In the *New Princeton Review* the author of a paper on Lord Byron says, "In thinking of *Don Juan* we should do what Dr. Johnson recommended — 'Clear our minds of cant.'" If by "cant" this writer means hypocritical sentiment, one need not object to his advice; but if he uses it to designate that censure which Christian morality and true religious feeling move one to pronounce upon an immoral book, then his use of the term is misapplied. A truly Christian man cannot "clear his mind" of that ethical repugnance which the reading of a bad book begets, except by doing violence to his moral sense—by throwing dust upon his moral perceptions. And this he dare not do lest he should incur guilt. It is presumed, however, that the writer cited above would not accept this interpretation of the term. He probably takes it for granted that one may hold the corrupt tendencies of his heart in such abeyance as to enjoy the æsthetic qualities of an immoral book, such as *Don Juan* confessedly is, without doing himself any serious injury. Perhaps this is possible to men in whom the intellectual dominates the passionate; to men who can read as critics, and at the same time hate even "the garment spotted by the flesh." But is it so to ordinary readers? Is it safe, is it right, is it truthful to say to the reading public generally, that it is not morally dangerous to wade through pools of immoral conceptions in order to gratify their æsthetic tastes? If immoral thought, made attractive by being clothed in beautiful style, be a moral poison, the Christian conscience can give none but a negative reply to this inquiry. Yet it may, perhaps, be worth while to note the utterances of certain speakers at a late meeting of the "Milwaukee Literary School," which may be accepted as representing the opinion of the *New Princeton* reviewer, and as indicating the growth of a disposition, in certain literary circles, to popularize the reading of books which are as ethically defective as they are artistically beautiful.

At a meeting of that school, at which Goethe and his writings were formally discussed, Professor Snyder, speaking of Goethe's *Elective Affinities*, said :

Pray, what is a work of art unless it tells you something? . . . Grown people must have a work of flesh and blood, which shows all the temptations of flesh and blood, with their consequences. That gives us a book which means something.

Following the professor, Mrs. M. A. Shorey, whose essay on this book was under discussion, observed.

I believe there are some things in the world which are not, and never can be made, or are not likely to be made, fit subjects for art. But there are many things

that are morbid, unwholesome, and immoral in the human life, that, when treated by an artist who has in his soul a lofty idea which he carries along with his treatment of the subject, and which has grown out of his actual experience—that experience being the source of his realistic power—then any unwholesome subject in morals may be treated; and that is precisely what Goethe did.

Professor W. T. Harris sustained these opinions of the *Elective Affinities* by saying :

The most wonderful thing in the art-form of this novel is, the exhaustiveness with which it treats the subject in all its possible phases. . . . Goethe takes it in its wholeness and presents it to us. . . . What is our conclusion about this novel? We have all heard of its immorality. But Goethe asserted that it is the only literary work he ever wrote that had a moral purpose. It is interesting to inquire, perhaps, what the critic calls immoral. He thinks, perhaps, Goethe should have come out, taken off his hat, and said at every opportunity to the people, "Now, my friends, this is very wrong indeed, and it ought not to go on." This is not the Bible method of teaching morality. The Bible shows to you immoral characters, and it shows their evil deeds coming back upon them, so that they get the fruit of their own doings. And Goethe lets those who do not conquer their elective affinities, in this novel, go down.

The reader, it is presumed, knows that Goethe's *Elective Affinities* is a story of lawless love and its tragic consequences. It describes in minute detail the genesis and development of illicit affections in its four principal characters. In the above extracts it is claimed that such delineations of immoral conduct are justifiable in a work of art, that is, in a novel or poem, provided the writer's pen is guided by an ethical purpose. The situations portrayed may be immoral, the author's ethical sentiment concealed, yet, because the former are true to the realities of human life, their artistic presentation is right, provided the wrong-doers are made to "go down" at the end of the tale.

These opinions, thus frankly expressed, are, as intimated above, widely prevalent among many who, in their own opinion, constitute the "literary world." Assuming with a scarcely concealed arrogance the perfection of their own aesthetic tastes and the authority of their literary and moral judgments, such critics sneeringly deride Christian moralists, who insist that highly wrought realistic descriptions of the working of sensual passions and of immoral actions are as pernicious in literature as is the nude in sculpture and painting. These parties defend the doctrine of the unspeakable Zola, who teaches that the literary artist "should work upon characters, passions, human and social facts, as the physicist and chemist work with inorganic bodies—as the physiologist works with living organisms." Consistently with this theory many of them commend that writer's unsavory novels, as they also do those of Eugene Sue, Ouida, Count Tolstoi, Smollett, Fielding, Richardson, etc. In the same spirit they accept the brilliant products of a poet's genius as an ample atonement for the immorality of his verses. And they regard as literary dolts those who, in writing of Byron, Shelley, or Burns, express regret that the beautiful in their productions is deeply shaded by so much that is immoral, and therefore offensively unesthetic.

In all this these critics write as if it were not an indestructible fact

that, as George W. Curtis says of human life, "the true beauty" of any literary production, be it poem or novel, "lies in its morality." They do not recognize the truth, which even Goethe perceived but did not permit to govern either his life or his pen, that "without the ethical element the actual is the low, the vulgar, the gross." Neither do they comprehend another truth strongly and beautifully put by Sidney Lanier, that

The greatest work has always gone hand in hand with the most fervent moral purpose. . . . The requirement has been from time immemorial that wherever there is contest as between artistic and moral beauty, unless the moral side prevail, all is lost. . . . He who has not yet perceived how artistic and moral beauty are convergent lines which run back into a common ideal origin, and who therefore is not afire with moral beauty just as with artistic beauty, . . . he is not yet the great artist.

But these defenders of the right of the novelist to "treat any unwholesome subject in morals" claim that such subjects are morally treated if the artist has "in his soul a lofty idea which he carries along with his treatment of the subject." What Mrs. Shorey means by this sentimental phrase is shown by her added remark that "this is precisely what Goethe did" in his *Elective Affinities*.

"Precisely what Goethe did" is thus stated by Professor Harris—"Goethe lets those who do not conquer their elective affinities in this novel go down." Hence these æsthetic critics understand the moral treatment of delineations of immoral conduct to consist, not in moral reprobation of the wrong actions as they transpire, but in simply letting the wrong doers "go down" when the drama of their crime is played out! On this principle one might claim that in such records of crime as *The Newgate Calendar* and *The Police Gazette* immoral conduct is morally treated, because the criminals of whom they treat are finally disposed of by the executioner's cord or by being placed behind the gratings of a state prison! Yet these works are more read by criminals than by the virtuous classes. The latter turn from them with moral disgust; the former feed upon them with the relish begotten by a depraved appetite. The "going down" of the victims of vice has less influence on the fears of men wedded to evil than the accounts of their daring careers have on their passion to excel in criminal achievements.

There is an ill-concealed scorn in Professor Harris's assertion, cited above, that the Bible method of teaching morality is not by saying that bad acts are bad, but by showing the deeds of immoral character bringing forth their appropriate fruits. He claims, therefore, that Goethe's method of treating vice is identical with that of Holy Scripture.

That this is a libel on God's word goes without saying. Every Bible reader knows that in its pages sin is branded as sin by whomsoever committed, as when it says of David's base treatment of Uriah and Bathsheba that it "displeased the Lord." He also knows that in Holy Writ sinful acts are described with a brevity which is as remarkable as the graphic force of its terse descriptions. There is no possibility of mistaking what the condemned act is. Yet its details are never dramatically

drawn out. The play and interplay of motive, temptation, and passion-al conflict are not so depicted as to captivate the imagination, and to call into activity sensations and passions analogous to those possessed by the persons it designates and condemns. Thus the Saviour tersely says of the prodigal son's vicious career, he "wasted his substance with riotous living," and puts this further statement concerning him into the mouth of the elder son: he "hath devoured thy living with harlots." Compare these comprehensive yet sufficiently suggestive words with the *Don Juan* of Byron, or with any story of the career of a man of the world by a writer of the school of Zola or Ouida, and it is at once apparent that to justify Goethe's *Elective Affinities* by pleading the methods of Scripture is to set up a plea which is both false and wicked. The offensive feature in Goethe's work is precisely that which is every-where absent from Holy Scripture. He describes the genesis and working of unlawful love with a skill that fascinates the imagination while keeping its criminality in the back-ground. He invests his characters with some charming qualities, and places them in such situations and under such necessitated natural conditions as excuse, if they do not wholly justify, the immorality of their emotions and the guilt of their desires and actions. Hence he moves his readers to pity where they ought to condemn. He disposes them to blame the law of marriage rather than the affections which give birth to the adulterous passions that culminate in a very sensational tragedy. The effect on the reader who surrenders himself to the fascination of the book is to put him in sympathy with the guilty parties, and to beget emotions kindred to those of its self-corrupted and mutually corrupting characters. And this effect is not obliterated by its tragic conclusion, by which Goethe chiefly, if not solely, expresses his "moral purpose" in writing it. This the reader regards as accidental, as something that he would have escaped had he been placed in a like situation. The ethical quality of the conduct described not being emphasized, he is not made to feel the retributive character of its tragic ending. He therefore rises from the perusal of the book a more or less demoralized man.

M. Taine, writing of the moral indignation caused in England by the publication of Byron's *Don Juan*, denounces that popular feeling as "puritanic prudery," and defiantly asks, "Can the proprieties prevent beauty from being beautiful? Will you condemn a picture of Titian for its nudity?" By these queries, put in the spirit of a man conscious that he is trampling upon sound moral feeling, he expresses the argument of many literary sentimentalists who, defending poetry and novels in which unwholesome depravities are portrayed with artistic skill, exclaim, "It is the beauty of their style and artistic construction that we admire. Their beauty affords us aesthetic pleasure, and we are not harmed by their realistic descriptions of the vices of society. Their beauty is beautiful in spite of their improprieties."

To this it may be replied, that such improprieties are subversive of the end of art, which Cousin fitly observes, is "the expression of moral beauty. . . Every work of art, whatever may be its form, small or great,

figured, sung, or uttered—every work of art, truly beautiful or sublime, throws the soul into a gentle or severe reverie that elevates it toward the Infinite." If this canon be accepted, how can books which paint vice in fascinating colors afford pure æsthetic pleasure? They express, not "moral beauty," but ethical deformity. Hence Sidney Lanier, writing of works of this class, and describing their effect on his own mind, says:

I protest that I can read none of these books without feeling as if my soul had been in the rain, drizzled, muddy, miserable. . . . They play upon life as upon a violin without a bridge, in the deliberate endeavor to get the most depressing tones possible out of the instrument. This is done under the pretense of showing us vice. . . . If I had my way with these classic books I would blot them from the face of the earth.

Now, Lanier's love of beauty was as intense as that of Keats. Yet, instead of yielding æsthetic sweetness to his highly developed sense of the beautiful, books of this sort were to him as vinegar to the teeth.

May we not, therefore, retort upon those who profess to enjoy the beautiful though it be imbedded in the mud of social vice, the already cited recommendation of Dr. Johnson, to "clear our minds of cant?" For what is it but literary cant, the insincerity of literary pride, to affirm that æsthetic delight can arise from the beautiful when thus united to vice? Does not the presentation of immoral conduct to a morally healthy mind instantly call its moral judgment into action? Does not that judgment spontaneously condemn such wrong conduct? When it sees the actors in the story deliberately sacrificing duty on the shrine of passion, as they do in Goethe's *Elective Affinities*, Byron's *Don Juan*, in Tolstoi's *Karenina*, and in many other works, thereby taking on ignoble characters, practicing injustice, and violating the obligations of honor, truth, and purity, does it not beget an instinctive aversion and a moral indignation so overwhelming that the charm of what is beautiful in the setting of the story cannot be enjoyed? Do not the images of immoral deeds offend the imagination, the reason, the heart? If ethical feeling be at all active in the mind of the reader, this aversion and indignation must arise within him, and, instead of being fascinated, he must indignantly recoil from such books with moral disgust, and be ready to say with Lanier, "If I had my way with these classic books I would blot them from the face of the earth." It would seem, therefore, that to talk of deriving pleasure from beauty when associated with moral misconduct is either literary cant or evidence of an ethically defective mind.

Nor is it alone the immoral book that forestalls the action of one's sense of the beautiful. If the book be moral and the author known to be immoral, one's love of the beautiful becomes as a dove wounded by the shaft of an archer. Unless, therefore, it can be said of an author that "there is nothing in his life to make one question the sincerity of his utterances, or to wonder that such beauty in the thought should fail to beautify the life," his writings, though containing much that is charming, do not satisfy one's sense of the beautiful. The charm of his thought and style no sooner begins to be felt than it is broken by its association with the

impurity of his life. But this is only further evidence that the truly beautiful and the truly good are normally so closely allied that there can be no real enjoyment of the beautiful except it be in harmony with rightly developed ethical perceptions and feelings.

In this age of many books and much reading no Christian educator or preacher can think without anxiety of the evil influence of immoral literature, especially when made attractive by the brilliant pens of men and women of genius. Mere protests against it, though not wholly unavailing, cannot keep it out of the hands of many readers. The young, especially, will seek acquaintance with it. But if a highly developed moral sense in those who read it robs it of much of its power to please and makes its immorality offensive, it follows that ethical instruction from the pulpit, in colleges, in our public schools, and in the Sunday-school may be regarded in the light of an antidote to its poisonous qualities. In truth, the materialistic spirit of the age demands for its correction a profound quickening of the national conscience, a more emphatic presentation of the ethical demands of the Gospel by the Church of to-day, especially because the influence of the literature of the New Theology is unfavorable to the broadening of men's ethical perceptions and the deepening of their ethical feeling. Instead of calling men to "behold the goodness and severity of God," as Paul did, this theology fixes public attention upon a sentimental view of his "goodness," but throws a veil over his "severity." It magnifies the divine mercy revealed in the Gospel, but fails to make conspicuous the awful fact that, even in this same Gospel, "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness." It makes the purpose of the divine administration to be, not the maintenance of justice and righteousness, but mainly the forgiveness of human sin. Thus sin being made to appear not as a terrible and ruinous evil which God regards with infinite hatred, but as a venial and temporary obstruction to human well-being, men learn to esteem it lightly, to treat it as a trifle, and to admit it into their practice with slight compunction whenever it can be made profitable to their present earthly interests. And is not the confessedly low tone of moral feeling manifest in the political, financial, business, and social life of the country traceable in part to the evil influence which the literature and preaching of this emasculated theology has already had on the national conscience?

A higher ethical cult is, therefore, the need and the duty of the hour. The ethical feeling of the people must be developed through the teaching of pure Christian doctrine concerning God and human responsibility up to the high level of the Sermon on the Mount. Such a result reached, what a marvelous change would be wrought, not alone in the sphere of literature, but also in our whole national life! In the judgment of infinite Wisdom, it is not literary cult, nor sound political economy, nor free institutions, nor commercial greatness, nor riches, nor all these combined, that can secure the true greatness of any people. It is not these things, desirable as they are in themselves as elements of

prosperity, but "righteousness, that exalteth a nation." Hence, to exclude sound ethical principles from the literature, the politics, the business, or the social life of the people is to withhold from them the salt which is essential to the preservation and perpetuity of public peace and prosperity.

---

#### THE PREACHERS' MEETING AND DR. McGLYNN — THEORIES OF HENRY GEORGE.

On Monday, the 19th of September last, Dr. McGlynn addressed the New York Methodist Preachers' Meeting, and at the conclusion of the address a resolution was passed by a majority vote recognizing his call "to a high duty," and commanding his work in preaching the "fatherhood of God" and the "brotherhood of man."

The "new crusade" of Dr. McGlynn, as it has been called, is generally supposed to coincide with the sentiments of Henry George, and the theories of the latter concerning land-ownership are supposed to be advocated by the eloquent doctor.

It is doubtless true that those theories are not favored by the Methodist preachers, and even those who voted for the resolution did not intend thereby to indorse the land theories mentioned. It cannot be that any considerable number of Methodists, whether of the clergy or the laity, assent to the agrarian doctrines of Henry George. They are, on the contrary, generally denounced as Communism in its most radical form. There is fear lest the attempt to command the culture, gentlemanly bearing, and conscientious independence of Dr. McGlynn may be interpreted in some quarters as a sanction of the fallacies of Mr. George concerning the ownership of land.

It is quite certain that had Dr. McGlynn belonged to the Methodist itinerancy and preached the doctrines referred to he would have been dealt with as an erratic devotee, and the fallacies of Communism would not have been excused, though covered by the high-sounding designation of "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."

So far as the recusant doctor has espoused the land doctrines of Henry George he will not receive aid and comfort from ministers or laymen of the Methodist Church. Those doctrines are believed to be repugnant to justice, social order, and the peace and prosperity of the community. The laws which they antagonize have existed since the foundation of our government, and the same principles are fundamental in the laws that exist in all civilized lands. There must be an upheaval of society and a reversal of the sentiments of jurists, law-makers, and writers on political economy before those laws can be changed to suit the George theories.

Considering the elements that commingle in the population of great cities it is to be deprecated that encouragement should be given to communistic doctrines, and especially that so graceful a writer as Henry George should set them forth, and so eloquent a voice as Dr. McGlynn's should

advocate them. The gloss of plausibility is spread over those doctrines in such graphic delineation and finished sentences that the unwary may be tempted to believe them, and the crowds in populous communities who have not given attention to the principles that every-where characterize the laws of civilized government may be disposed to accept them.

Mr. George makes many utterances which are true and forcible. Take this instance:

That he who produces should have—that he who saves should enjoy—is consistent with human reason and with the natural order.\*

And yet he claims that one who has invested his money in a piece of land which afterward is enhanced in value by the growth of a contiguous city appropriates the earnings of others!

For land [as he writes] is not of that species of things to which the presumption of rightful property attaches. This does attach to things that are properly termed wealth and that are the produce of labor.†

How ownership of land was acquired in the past can have no bearing upon the question of how we should treat land now. ‡

Again:

It is needless to insist that property in land rests only on human enactment, which may, at any time, be changed without violation of moral law. §

1. There are no writers on political economy, nor jurists, nor judges, who have ever thus impugned the decalogue. With one accord they hold that property, including land, cannot be taken from the owner, even for public purposes, by change of the law, unless just compensation be given for it.

While it is true that land titles rest on human enactment, it is also true that the consent of all civilized nations and the practice of ages have determined the rightfulness of such enactments. Nor can there be any just distinction between the title to such property and the title to the ownership of the cattle of our neighbor, which we are, by the highest command, forbidden to covet. Time, circumstances, and the growth of a contiguous city may enhance the value of a herd of cattle, and are we to believe that such increased value is in the owner's hands the appropriation of the labor of others?

It is upon the ground of the general good that all laws concerning property are based. The public welfare has been the chief end of all human constitutions and laws. It were as safe to abolish human laws and statutory penalties against robbery, fraud, and theft as to overturn the laws that secure property rights. Such attempts would be every-where regarded as an attack upon the existence of society itself. The mature judgment of the cultivated intelligence of civilized communities has established the existence of rights of property, including the titles to land, and after centuries of experience and approval it is not probable that such judgment can be reversed unless Socialism shall become rampant,

\* *Social Problems*, p. 60.

‡ *Answer to Argyll*, p. 51.

† *Answer to Argyll*, p. 49.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

and revolution and anarchy take the place of order and good government. It has often been said that to change the rules of property, without adequate compensation, is a mischievous violation of one of the elementary doctrines of political economy. Legislatures have no such power. Hence, while private ownership of land must yield to the public good, and the sovereignty of the State, under the exercise of eminent domain, may take lands for public use, yet our constitutions provide it can only be done upon payment of proper compensation to the private owner. It would be a violation of moral law to do otherwise.

No free people would intrust their rights of person or of property to blind chance, nor to the fallacies of socialists or communists, but they are careful to adopt constitutions and enact laws to secure both the one and the other; and the most beautiful phenomenon in the history of mankind is the increasing prosperity of peoples of a constitutional government under which laws are made for the security of the rights of person and of property. Despotic rule, royal authority, and communistic theories have been, and are, subordinated to such fundamental rules and statutory regulations. Territorial jurisdiction, though originally the tenure of the State, has, for the welfare of society and the progress of civilization, been subordinated under approved rules to private ownership and inheritance, so that the prosperity of society and the march of improvement have not been impeded. Families are fixed in the homes of themselves and their fathers, and the spirit of patriotic attachment to their country goes along with their right to the ownership of their lands. They are not nomadic, as are the Indian tribes, nor are they careless of the improvement of their farms and cottage homes, as would be a promiscuous crowd each of whom, under the Henry George theory, could say,

"No foot of land do I possess."

The faith of the government and the security of the common and statute law are the bases upon which the right of private ownership rests. The history of empire is full of revolutions. There will be another revolution before that faith shall be disregarded or that security shall be broken down. The good sense of the community will gibe at the possibility of such a rupture of our social stability. We are too far removed from the Dark Ages and despotic governments to sponge away our well-tried constitutions and our improved codes of written law. Nothing better has been devised by human governments since the establishment of Christianity.

Lord Coleridge, in a late speech at Glasgow, said:

The right of property, that is, the right to possess peaceably what you have yourself acquired, underlies all society. . . . We may assume that, as a rule, no changes in the laws of property or the condition of its enjoyment are likely to be made, or ought to be made, except either with the consent of persons affected by the change or with compensation if their assent is not given.

2. Every man is entitled, as Henry George admits, to the fruit of his own labor. This in his *Social Problem*, p. 108, is fully asserted. How do his land theories comport with this principle of natural justice?

He says in another place: \*

I hold that the land was not created for one generation to dispose of, but as a dwelling-place for all generations; that the men of the present are not bound by any grants of land the men of the past may have made, and cannot grant away the rights of the men of the future. . . . I hold that the titles to the ownership of land which the government of the United States is now granting are of no greater moral validity than the land-titles of the British Isles, which rest historically upon the forcible spoliation of the masses.

Now, to procure many of the parcels of these lands industrious men have invested their hard-earned savings, and in numerous instances have executed mortgages for part of the purchase money. The mortgages have frequently been taken by other men who have earned by the labor of their hands the money thus invested. Their wives and children look to this security for their future support, and the widows and children of the purchaser look to the granted lands for theirs. What does Henry George propose? Will he treat this land as property, and thus save to the earners their rightful means? No; these titles are to be extinguished, for they began ages ago in "the forcible spoliation of the masses!" Let these lands, he says, be transferred to the State, and let the State lease them for rent to the best bidder! This is his panacea for existing poverty!

The language of the Duke of Argyll seems to be quite an appropriate comment:

He [Henry George] preaches systematically not only the high privilege, but the positive duty, of repudiation. He is not content with urging that no more bits of unoccupied land should ever be sold, but he insists upon it that the ownership of every bit already sold should be resumed without compensation to the settler who has bought it, who has spent upon it years of labor, and who from first to last has relied on the security of the State and the honor of its government. There is no mere practice of corruption which has ever been alleged against the worst administrative body in any country that can be compared in corruption with the desolating dishonor of this teaching.†

Here is some of the teaching thus denounced:

We should satisfy the law of justice, we should meet all economic requirements, by at one stroke abolishing all private titles, declaring all land public property, and letting it out to the highest bidders in lots to suit, under such conditions as would sacredly guard the private right to improvements.‡

I do not propose either to purchase or to confiscate private property in land. The first would be unjust; the second, needless. Let the individuals who now hold it still retain, if they want to, possession of what they are pleased to call *their* land. Let them continue to call it *their* land. Let them buy and sell and bequeath and devise it. We may safely leave them the shell, if we take the kernel. *It is not necessary to confiscate land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent.* §

What nonsense is this! How can those who now hold it still retain "their land," if it is to be rented by the State to the highest bidder? And how can it be maintained that the procedure is not confiscation, when the "shell" only is left, and the communists get the "kernel?" Should valuable lands be thus rented how long would it be before they were denuded of their produce-bearing quality in the hands of unsorupulous

\* *Answer to Argyll*, p. 51.

† *Prophet of San Francisco*, p. 23.

‡ *Progress and Poverty*, p. 291.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 392.

and careless tenants? And what sort of a tenant might the highest bidder be?

Mr. George maintains that private property in land is inconsistent with the best use of it. His philosophy fails to show how the present owners of land will not be robbed of their rightful property should his proposed scheme succeed; nor does it clearly appear why robbery of a land-owner is less a crime than forcibly taking the property of a communist. If the land-owner came honestly by his property and paid value for it, there is no principle in law or morals that can sanction a procedure to forcibly take away his ownership without compensation. There is under our law civil equality, and those who clamor for innovation, with nothing to lose, have before them the same methods of prudence, economy, and industry for success in life as have been beneficial to many of these land-owners.

3. Vivid pictures of the poorer classes are drawn by Mr. George, as if the condition of poverty was the want of the particular lands of the land-owners! How much of want and poverty are due to indolence, intemperance, vice, and crime is not mentioned. And whether if there were a present division of "lots to suit," among all classes, there would be an abolition of poverty, while indolence, intemperance, vice, and crime continue, it would be interesting to inquire. Beggars and tramps would doubtless multiply if the scheme suggested by Mr. George should ever be adopted. At present it is well known that indigence and want are relieved in a great measure by the liberal bestowments of the land-owners through many charitable institutions. Was David mistaken when he said: "I . . . now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread?"

4. There is not opportunity at present to pursue the subject, but any thoughtful man in reading the books of Henry George will see many objections to his agrarian theories. Considerations will arise touching the danger of the attempt to sweep away existing bulwarks of civilized society, and the opening of the door to communistic tendencies, that may plunge our peaceful land into the horrors of socialism and anarchy. It should rather be the purpose of those who would benefit the masses to seek to strengthen the obligations of honesty and of love to our neighbor. The preservation of social order and morality, the persuasions to industry and temperance, respect for the laws and the rights of property, are better panaceas for poverty than all the communistic remedies that have been broached. A land-owner is not an oppressor; in general, he is a benefactor; and those who would crusade against him are not called "to a high duty."

The constitutions and laws of this land—in the particular now assailed by Communists—were established before such theorists came here. The people have been prosperous, and thousands of the poor have risen from indigence to opulence under the fostering beneficence of our institutions. Let us frown upon all attempts to overthrow them.

E. L. F.

## SENTIMENTAL SOCIOLOGY.

The organization of the laboring classes for the purpose of redressing their alleged grievances by means of strikes, "boycotts," and political action, is a fact so pregnant with dangerous possibilities that no Christian citizen can afford to treat it with contempt. And the more closely he studies it in the light of past history and of the law of human brotherhood, the more seriously he will ask himself, "How ought I to feel toward it, and what ought to be my action with respect to it? Ought I to promote it, or to do what I may to hinder it?"

This question of duty, the duty of both the individual and the Church, compels the further inquiry, What is the significance of this formidable array of the industrial proletariat against the more prosperous classes? Is it a protest against real grievances? Is it a crusade of sentiment begotten by extravagant and false conceptions of the practical benefits derivable from the democratic principles which underlie our governmental system? Or is it a providential movement, by which Christ is using an outburst of selfish human passion to compel the attention of his Church to the duty of making more determined efforts to win the working classes to his service? They belong to him, for he has redeemed them. They need him. And such is their ever-increasing number, and such the strength of their influence for evil, that his Church must either win them to the truth or be shorn of her influence over the lower orders of our population through their antagonism. May we not then, if we listen attentively, hear His still small voice whispering amid the clamors of these disturbed classes, and saying to his people, "These toilers belong to me. Bid them come to me, therefore, and I will give them rest?"

Is it said that these restless workmen have some real grievances? Unquestionably many of them have. Labor is sometimes, perhaps often, unjustly treated; but its wrongs are not now what they were in the dead past, when it had vastly more to endure than it has at present. For, let workmen say what they will, they cannot, if intelligent, be blind to the fact that during the last half century the spirit of justice and kindness, begotten by Christianity, has penetrated the business world so far as to sensibly ameliorate the condition of the working classes. When, in the history of humanity, was the workman so well paid, so comfortably housed, clothed, and fed as now? When was his manhood so respectfully recognized and treated as at present? When or where had he such opportunities to rise above his condition as he has in America to-day? Is it not a palpable fact that, if the working classes would lay aside their vices, live sober, industrious lives, and form economical habits, a very large proportion of them would be able to pass their days not only in happy ignorance of the miseries of poverty, but also in the possession of such comforts as would make their lives truly enjoyable? Nevertheless, with all this in their favor, it need not be denied that the lot of many is still hard—harder than it need be, or than it would be if the parties who own our mines, manage our great railways, operate our manufacturing establishments, and otherwise

employ many laborers, were obedient, as they ought to be, to the great law of human brotherhood. In so far, therefore, as working-men and women are overworked, unfairly paid, or inhumanly treated, they have grievances which demand redress. And with their desires and endeavors to obtain such redress every Christian citizen and every Church ought to sympathize, provided always that the means they employ and the measures they seek are judicious, morally right, and in harmony with sound social and political principles.

Unfortunately for themselves, as well as for the community, these labor organizations in protesting against their real and imaginary wrongs have given place to a vexed and angry temper of mind. In resenting injustice, they have become unjust themselves. Resisting oppression, they have become oppressors. By dwelling on what they judge to be their due, they have become so morally confused as to be unable to distinguish between what is and what is not due them. They have consequently set up selfism as their standard of moral judgment. What they desire is, their false ideal of right; and opposition to their desires they brand as injustice to themselves. Animated by these confused ideas of right and wrong, they have come to "view their most wanton acts of injustice to others as resistance to other people's injustice to them."

Let him who questions the fairness of these statements look at their "strikes," their "boycotts," their persecution of non-union workmen, their insistence that no workman shall perform more than a prescribed quantity of work in a day, and that a minimum quantity; their claim for equal wages for labor of unequal value; their dictation to employers respecting the employment of non-union men, the number of their apprentices, and the wages they shall pay; their demand that the pay for eight hours' work shall be the same as is now paid for ten hours; and their proposal to secure a law taxing land up to its full rental value for the benefit of landless men. These are their favorite measures, their common practices. And every one of them is rooted in rank injustice to others. They are all indefensible at the bar of an intelligent moral judgment. They are the outcome of a blind, angry selfism, resenting real or fancied injustice by inflicting wanton acts of injustice upon others.

Thus it appears, that while the proletariat agitation has its genesis in an attempt to redress its grievances, it has already become a crusade of sentiment. An exaggerated sense of wrong possesses it. But to conceal its real animus, and give it an aspect of reasonableness, its leading agitators are teaching their misguided followers that their measures, actual and probable, are justified by the principle of equality asserted in the Declaration of Independence. These leaders misinterpret the axiomatic truth in that noble document, that all men are "created equal," by affirming that it implies every man's right to occupy and use as much land as he deems necessary for his subsistence, albeit it is obviously clear that this axiom does not touch the question of right to property of any kind; that it does not even affirm the equality of men physically, morally, or intellectually; but only that every man has an equal right "to life, liberty,

and the pursuit of happiness." But their false interpretation of a great principle intensifies the working-man's sense of injustice, and strengthens his purpose to secure redress through organization and the attainment of political power. That he does not comprehend the meaning of the axiom invoked by his teachers in apparent justification of his efforts is made evident by the injustice of the measures he has adopted—measures which deny to his non-union fellow-craftsmen and to his employers the very same liberty and free pursuit of happiness which he claims for himself. By this denial he cuts from beneath his own feet the platform on which all human liberty, including his own, of course, reposes. Hence his crusade is not inspired by a principle intelligently accepted, but, as already observed, by blind, passionate purpose to seek retaliation for grievances which he greatly exaggerates, and which can only be removed by the triumph of Christian benevolence over the sordid greed of men who worship mammon and despise humanity.

As this sentiment is so largely the product of false theories, based on wrong interpretations of axiomatic truth, it must be checkmated by the propagation of sound social principles. Unlinked to reason, sentiment is blind. When it is inspired by clear views of truth, it is a spur to duty. When it is the effervescence of false opinions it becomes unreasoning passion, reckless of every thing save the selfish ends of the man in whose breast it rages. The French Revolution, as the reader knows, had its germs in Rousseau's sentimental presentations of his theories concerning "the pristine equality of mankind and the social contract." And in the sentiment begotten by the superficial and false sociology of the times we have a social force, a growing passion, sufficiently dangerous to move thinking men to earnest and kind endeavors to correct the erroneous notions which are in part its springs. Men must be taught from the pulpit and by the press that the doctrine of human equality is simply that of equal right to the free use of one's capacity for the acquirement, through honest industry, of the means of subsistence and happiness. Each man's share of the common gifts of God must therefore be determined, not by communistic laws, but by individual ability and diligence.

The attention of the disaffected working-man should also be called to the stubborn fact that much of the discomfort of his class arises out of thriftless use of wages, or self-indulgent habits. He must be made to look at many of his own craft who, with no better sources of income than himself, have purchased land and become the owners of comfortable homes, while others, owing to constant expenditures for tobacco and strong drink, and to frequent days of voluntary idleness, are living in hired, scantily furnished tenements. It surely cannot be difficult to wring from a man of ordinary intelligence a frank admission that much of the poverty of the poor is not chargeable to their employers nor to society, but to their own self-indulgence and unthrifty habits.

With respect to the oppression of working-men by covetous capitalists, it must be shown that its removal cannot be suddenly secured by legal enactments, but must be overcome by the gradual operation of that spirit

of justice and benevolence which is both the beauty and the glory of Christianity. As noted above, that spirit has already wrought a great amelioration in the standing and condition of laboring men. It has, indeed, expressed itself in laws forbidding many abuses once generally prevalent. It is still working its way with ever-increasing energy into the heart of society, creating a public opinion in favor of workingmen which the most avaricious capitalists dare not openly defy. It shows itself also in the disposition of very many employers to pay as liberal wages as their profits fairly permit; in the voluntary annual distribution of a portion of their net gains among their *employés* made by not a few business firms, and in the favor with which some influential business men regard the co-operative principle. On every side there is evidence that Christ, the truest friend and guide the poor man ever had or can have, is moving mankind through his Gospel toward that practical recognition of human brotherhood which is destined to destroy both the form and spirit of caste, and to make rich and poor one in him. Not that poverty will ever be wholly destroyed; for so long as men are naturally unequal in capacity they will be of unequal value to society, and therefore unequally rewarded for their labor. Out of this inevitable difference the distinction between rich and poor will perpetually arise. Disease, inherited weakness, indolent habits, and debilitating vices will also cause many to be more or less dependent, and therefore poor. Consequently, it is idle dreaming to talk of annihilating poverty, or of compelling men by law to pay equal prices for unequal service. Nevertheless, it is no dream, but a certitude of faith, that as Christianity triumphs the spirit of human love will be so tender and so wide-reaching as to take thoughtful care of the helpless poor, to dethrone selfism from its supremacy in the business world, and to establish the reign of justice, truth, and benevolence over every mart of trade, every exchange, and every business organization in the land. Under the reign of these benign principles the working classes will have all their real grievances amply redressed.

To this suggestion, the impatient haste of labor organizations replies that the processes of Christianity are too slow. "We cannot wait," they respond with unreasoning scorn. "We must have the redress we seek at once, and we will compel it by political action, and through such changes in the laws as will free us without delay from the control of capitalists and employers." But these replies are the offspring, not of reason and reflection, but of excited, angry feeling. Counting their formidable rolls of membership, they feel the confidence which is born of strength, and are bent on achieving immediate results without regard to their social consequences. Foolish confidence! It mistakes might for right. It looks to the machinery of law for results which are unattainable except by growth of character. A remark by Bodin, an eminent French lawyer, is pertinent to this consciousness of strength: "The mightier a man is," he observes, "the more justly and temperately he ought to behave himself toward all men." And what is true of a mighty man is equally true of an organized body of men, whose might is more in

their numbers than in the wisdom of their measures. Might, to be beneficial to any class, must be guided by wisdom and justice, since when allied with injustice it is gigantic wickedness, which can work nothing but evil.

To bridle the hastiness of these organizations their members need to be taught the lesson which God has written on every page of the history of humanity—that the progress of society is not secured by sudden precipitations, but by the gentle processes of slow growth. Therefore, says Bodin,

We ought, in the government of a well-ordered commonwealth, to imitate and follow the great God of nature, who in all things proceedeth easily and by little and little; who of a little seed causeth to grow a tree for height and greatness right admirable, and yet for all that insensibly.

Von Logau expresses this grand truth by saying:

"Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small;  
Though with patience he stands waiting, with exactness grinds he all."

Hence, unless man sets his mills at the same rate of speed at which Jehovah runs the mills of his providence, he may be sure that they will be dashed to pieces in their inevitable collision. Therefore, though it may be possible under our democratic system for labor organizations to bring about important and speedy changes in the laws, yet such changes, being inconsiderately made, and not in the interest of the whole people, but of one class only, may introduce such disturbances into the body politic as will bring down ruin upon the heads of the very class which procured them for its own special benefit.

In seeking legislation for their own exclusive benefit our labor organizations betray a selfism which bodes not good, but injury, to society. As Lord Bacon remarks:

It is a poor center of a man's actions—himself. . . . The referring of all to a man's self is a desperate evil in . . . a citizen in a republic. For whatsoever affairs pass such a man's hands he crooketh them to his own ends; which must needs be often eccentric to the ends of the State.

Again he says:

It is good not to try experiments in States except the necessity be urgent, or the utility be evident, and well to beware that it be the reformation that draweth on the change, and not the desire of change that pretendeth the reformation.

These words are nuggets of political wisdom, which deserve the attention not alone of labor reformers, but also of citizens who, without due consideration, are inclined to bring their political party into sympathy with them. This was done by those legislators who voted for the Saturday afternoon holiday and for the so-called "labor day," both of which, the former especially, have already proved to be "eccentric to the ends of the State," that is, to the general good. Who, then, can measure the dimensions of the evils that the embodiment in laws of the principles and measures of the labor organizations would produce? As to the selfism of their false principles there can be but one opinion. They are deduced, not from comprehensive study of the interests of society, but from the habit which Bacon calls "a desperate evil;" namely, the habit of referring all things

to the desires and supposed needs of their class. Instead of thinking and acting as "citizens of the republic," they think and act as members of the laboring class, whose interests they regard as supreme. And many of them have become so possessed by this notion as to look on the propertied classes as parties having no rights which they feel bound to respect. All this is unfortunate, and prejudicial to their cause and prospects. It is undemocratic, anti-American, anti-Christian, and shows how deeply the movement is rooted, not in intelligent desire to promote the general good, but in the selfishness of human nature.

In dealing with this proletarian agitation the Churches have a duty to perform. In their relation to it they represent the Christ, and are bound to treat it with reference to the end for which they exist—the salvation of men, especially of the poor. Seeing that it is partly based on selfish sentiment they cannot unqualifiedly sympathize with it; but inasmuch as it has some real grievances they can and ought to do what may rightly be done to redress such grievances. As to its sentiment, it needs to be noted that sentiment cannot be changed by direct and dogmatic antagonism, which only intensifies it. But it may be softened and even melted by awakening an opposite feeling. If, therefore, the Churches, while condemning the unwise and unjust measures of these agitated classes, set themselves earnestly to their divinely appointed task of so teaching the doctrine of human brotherhood as to promote in the propertied classes, especially in those who call Christ their Master, a disposition to further that amelioration of the condition of the lower orders which Christianity has already so beautifully begun, they may beget in them a sentiment of gratitude and affection which will go far toward displacing their existing selfish sentiment. That the best and truest human friends of the working classes are in the Churches is undeniable. That some church members are lacking in thoughtful, benevolent, and just consideration for their *employés* is, alas! too true. Let the tenderly charitable and just spirit of the Churches bring these inconsiderate brethren up to the true standard of human brotherhood; let them be faithfully taught that their capacity to acquire wealth is God's gift endowing them with power to become ministering angels to humanity, and that when it is consecrated to the base, selfish, and foolish end of accumulating a vast fortune for the sake of the prestige, the show, and the social position usually conceded to the owners of wealth, it is shamefully prostituted. By such teaching, and by identifying themselves with every judicious measure for the moral and material elevation of the laboring classes, the churches can most assuredly make it too apparent to be truthfully contradicted, that the love of Him who was himself "a poor man, and who died for poor men," possesses them; and also that there is in them a vision

"Of justice, mercy, wisdom, tenderness  
To wrong and pain, and knowledge of its cure;  
And these embodied in a Christly form  
That best transmits them, pure as first received,  
From God above them to mankind below."

Standing in this beautiful attitude of practical sympathy with the physical necessities of the working multitude, the Churches, aided by Heaven's richest spiritual gifts, will succeed perhaps as never before in drawing multitudes even from the lowest deeps of poverty into the fold of their Lord. In that glad day, come when it may, the social antagonisms which now disturb the peace and awaken the anxieties of the propertied classes will, if not at once wholly overcome, gradually melt away. For Christian love will prove itself to be the restorer of social order and the bond of brotherhood.

---

#### FOREIGN, RELIGIOUS AND LITERARY.

THE JESUITS IN BRAZIL are the source of much trouble and anxiety to the German Protestants, who have emigrated thither in great numbers. Their expulsion from Germany resulted in the transfer of many of them to German settlements in foreign lands, and a well organized society, with abundant means, is now in Brazil, with *padres* who know how to effect their purpose in the press and the confessional.

The province most annoyed by their presence is that of *Rio Grande do Sul*, in southern Brazil. For a long series of years now they have been working among a German population of not less than one hundred thousand souls. Most of the German parishes, in the cities as in the country, have fallen into their hands, and they have also succeeded in disturbing the friendly relations that formerly existed between the two confessions (Lutheran and Reformed), and have stirred up the Catholics to the point of fanaticism. Their influence in the matter of mixed marriages has been especially fatal, which can now be solemnized only by a priest of the State Church, and the danger of annihilation of the Protestant congregations is now only averted by the self-sacrificing activity and the greatest exertion of the Protestant clergy. Indeed, there are now many congregations in large and isolated districts where no evangelical pastor appears. This is partly caused by the want of energetic and practical workers, but more still by the need of money to bear the expenses of itinerating preachers.

The peculiar mission of the Jesuits in Brazil is the elementary school; and as their treasury seems always full they are able to establish schools wherever to them seems most desirable, and to erect buildings adapted to their purposes. About twenty years ago the Jesuits laid the foundation of an institution in San Leopoldo; and with the large appropriations which come to them from Germany and Italy they have yearly increased and improved their buildings till now they are veritable school palaces; and in a few years they will undoubtedly be in possession of an entire quarter of the city. As there are about twenty-five of the order engaged here, together with a number of "Christian brothers," they are always able to put the right man in place, and make the most of the pupils in-

trusted to their care. In the absence of advantages for the Protestant population, and also, alas! from the indifference of the many, it is not surprising that many of them send their sons to the Jesuits and their daughters to the "Sisters" for their education. This field is so propitious for *propaganda* that it is not surprising that in the course of their studies many of the pupils acquire the desire to change their faith. Already quite a number of those who have gone forth from the institution have become teachers, and have been sent by the government into the German colonies as teachers. In this precarious condition a call for help has gone forth from the "Evangelical Association for the Protestant Germans in America," and a faithful agent is now in the Fatherland soliciting aid for the distressed Protestants.

THE NEW FRENCH SCHOOL LAW compels the government to secularize all the public schools in the country within three years. There are many places in which the majority of the parish council confide the parish schools to the members of religious orders, and quite as many places where, against the undoubted majority, the council dismisses the "congregationalists" and installs—by force, sometimes—the teacher appointed by the prefect. For some time, however, the secularizing of the elementary schools in the parishes by which they have not been expressly demanded has been effected with less noise and with more gentleness toward the ecclesiastical elements. The latter, therefore, now begin to cherish the hope to obtain in the Chambers, at least, if not from the Government, the privilege of retaining the congregational schools now in operation; and they also hope that before the expiration of the term the school-law concerning the secularizing of the schools may be suspended.

But the Government will scarcely be able to grant this wish without the most serious suspicions as to its relations with the Conservative members of the Right; for the legally prescribed and organized exclusion of the church and religious education from the public school is regarded by the Radicals as the greatest Republican triumph, together with compulsory school attendance and gratuitous instruction. If, therefore, the present Minister of Public Instruction, who seems desirous of fully carrying out the law, still remains minister, and no special causes intervene, the new school ordinance will be executed in the entire land before the expiration of three years. And, moreover, in the recent budget estimate for the Ministry of Instruction, for the year 1888, the State appropriation for the expense of the primary schools was reduced from fourteen to ten millions. According to the instructions of the minister, as the law provides, every parish where gratuitous instruction is introduced must make up the deficit caused by the abolition of school dues. The State is to provide only for the poorer parishes, that are clearly not able to bear the burden.

FROM ITALY there comes a reply of jeers and contempt to the intimations of the leader of the German Ultramontanes that they will restore the temporal power of the Pope. The *Popolo Romano*, the organ of the Italian

Liberals, sends to Windhorst and his colleagues the following words : "As to the German crusade, it is really a pity that they delay it, for it would aid in reviving the Roman Carnival, now in a moribund state. And as to our yielding to the pressure of foreign states, Dr. Windhorst may rest assured that as long as Italy has a soldier, a cannon, or a gun-boat it will present a bold front, not only to the pressure, bgt also to the armed coalition, of the mightiest States. But these have very different matters to attend to from the temporal power of the Pope. In the resolutions and demands of the Clericals there remains but one thing that has in any measure a positive character, and that is the right of these gentlemen to present such demands—a right which, as far as we are concerned, they may continue to claim to the end of their days."

Now these are very plain words, and let him who would believe that they carry no weight since the death of Depretis look over the columns of the *Riforma*, the special organ of the present chief of the cabinet, Minister Crispi, and he will there see, in addition to the *fortiter in re* of the *Popolo Romano*, also the *suaviter in modo* of the present regime. This sheet, in discussing the papal brief to Cardinal Rampolla, called attention to the fact that nothing but the existing law of papal guarantee protected the writer in the Vatican from legal prosecution. For said brief was clearly a violation of the Italian press-law as to threats of violence against constitutional order. But the attorney-general of Italy was wise enough to let the matter rest.

One end, at least, has been obtained by this. The good-natured people of Italy, who were tempted to believe, by the papal allocution, in a reconciliation between the Quirinal and the Vatican, are now more than ever convinced that the Papacy means to remain on a war-footing with Italy. And therefore the earnest and dignified language of King Humbert in his telegram to Cardinal Agostini, patriarch of Venice, who had begged him to withhold his signature from the law concerning a war tax. In regard to the resolutions of the German Clericals in Treves, the Italian press puts the question : "What would the German government do if this ultramontane body should demand German territory for the temporal rule of the Pope ?" It is well that the German pilgrimage of the papal jubilee is postponed, for they would receive a cold welcome now.

THE WAVE OF EMIGRATION from the Fatherland continues to increase the anxiety of the government and of many Christian bodies, both of which suffer materially by this depletion of their forces. The Lutheran Church is just now making a renewed effort to induce all emigrants to leave *via* Hamburg, where they can receive aid and advice from the Emigrant Mission there established. The annual report of this organization announces a large increase in emigration from this port, now nearly one hundred thousand annually. Of these by far the larger portion direct their course to the United States, but not all by the Hamburg vessels; many go to English and other ports to embark, though the tendency now is to leave from Hamburg direct. The mission is now warning emigrants

from taking foreign vessels, and this appeal is evidently a matter of conscience and not of business. The interruption of the journey and the delay in other ports are attended with expense and danger. And again, it seems that the reports of gambling and fleecing the emigrants on the English vessels have reached the ears of the Germans. We have long known that the cabins of many of the foreign steamers are little better than gambling saloons; but it seems that the cunning sporters of the lower order take passage in the steerage, with a view to entice the emigrants to drink and play, and thus to rob them of the hard-earned savings with which they had hoped to make a start in the New World. Despair and suicide often follow in the track of these gamblers, who, the missionaries say, are excluded by their influence from the Hamburg vessels.

Not only Germans, but Austrians, Russians, Italians, and even Scandinavians are now being attracted to Hamburg to embark. Around all these the mission is endeavoring to throw its shield as a network of Christian love and religious influence. Many gaps will of course remain in this, for now nearly half of the great stream flows to England to embark for various ports, many to South America. The good office that the mission will perform is to meet them as they come and welcome them to a Christian refuge while they are waiting to embark, and to take their names and places of destination, to learn their religious preferences, and give them advice or circulars that will tell them just where they can find sympathizing friends on the other side, instead of falling into the hands of those who would use and advise them for selfish purposes. Valuable hints are given to them regarding location, soil, forests and plains, wood and water, and even industrial interests in various sections.

A very earnest endeavor is naturally made by this mission to keep them out of the hands of other denominations, or rather, in the hands of the Lutheran Church. They therefore consign the emigrants who will accept it to Lutheran agents in the States, who welcome them to a temporary home, and provide them with useful information in regard to their journey. This is a great blessing to emigrants, who would otherwise fall into the hands of interested agents paid for leading them where their advisers would reap a bounty from them. It would be a great blessing to us if all emigration were thus religiously and morally cared for from the start; and would greatly assist us in keeping the stream of German emigration in the right path, and prevent it from drifting off into the ranks of sabbath-breakers and free-thinkers.

AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION has just been held in Zürich against the *misuse* of intoxicating drinks, to which there came delegates from various lands and of the most various views. Some came to combat the abuse, and others to condemn the use in any shape, of alcoholic drinks. Although the associations represented expressed their opinions in very different lines, they all joined heartily in the battle against drunkenness, and, indeed, the general use of liquors.

Switzerland has assumed the monopoly of the sale of spirits, and ac-

cording to the assertion of the director of the Swiss bureau for this trade, who was present and opened the discussion, it is there regarded as a necessary evil. All the cantons are now brought under one rule, and from the profits of the trade each canton is to receive its fixed share. Ten per cent. of this is to be applied to the effort to decrease the use of liquors. One canton, that has not yet engaged in the manufacture of spirits, has resolved to use its entire quota for that purpose. The spirit-monopoly has failed in Germany, and it were to the credit of Switzerland had she too refused to become a dealer in spirits to the demoralization of her people. The congress considered also the mode of treating the drink question in the schools, being incited to regard and study this matter by the report made from the United States, which was quite a surprise to many of them. After some discussion, it was resolved that it is advisable that the subject be brought to the knowledge of the children in the elementary school-books, and that cards of warning against the use of liquor be hung in the schools, so as to attract the attention of the young.

IN HANOVER they have had a *summer school* for instruction in the home mission work, and it was a decided success. It lasted about ten days, and was attended by over sixty clergymen and theological students, mainly young men. They were all accommodated in one building, so that they could be in constant intercourse. The entire day was given to the study, the work being divided into sections. Among the teachers were some of the most distinguished clergymen of the land, whose advice and training on the basis of their long experience were invaluable.

During the ten days of the course various institutions in the city and surrounding country were visited and inspected, including the asylum for idiots and the working colony for the reform of tramps. To these were added studies and lectures regarding the press and colportage, the care of abandoned children, discharged prisoners, young men's associations, and the whole long list of the benevolent work of the age. One valuable session was devoted to the consideration of the relation of home mission work to the Church. In the course of this discussion it was demonstrated that the work is the product of historical development finding its origin naturally in the Church, but branching out in all directions to aid it in the suppression of vice, the alleviation of suffering, and the spread of gospel truth with gospel work. Special reference was made to the growth of the work in all Germany, beginning with the noble trio of Christian philanthropists—Fliedner, Löhe, and Wichern. The final conclusions reached were, that the Church and the home missions need each other; but the Church must be the solid background on which all rests, and the guarantee for the continuance of the work.

THE PAPAL JUBILEE will soon be in full blast. On the last day of December, 1887, it will be fifty years since the Pope was consecrated as priest. On this day an international deputation will present to him the congratulations of the Roman Catholic world, and the money gifts that

have been sent to Rome. On the following day, on an altar expressly erected for the occasion, the Pontiff will read a mass for all who have participated in this contribution. On the same day, in presence of the pope, the Exposition of the Vatican will be opened in a building expressly erected for this purpose in one of the courts of the Vatican—to exhibit the gifts of all lands sent to the holy father. From the first of January till the month of May the pope will receive the pilgrimages from various lands and sections. The larger bands of pilgrims will be received in St. Peter's, and "*with closed doors if the situation in Rome shall not be materially altered before that time.*" The mass will be read over the grave of St. Peter, the pope will sit on a throne, and the pilgrims will pass by so that each one may see him and receive his individual blessing.

---

#### MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCE.

MEETING OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE.—The General Committee charged with the duty of making appropriations to the various missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of deciding what fields shall be occupied as missions, and of apportioning the amounts to be raised to the various Conferences, held its annual session in this city in November. The treasurer's report was an inspiring one, showing that the "Million Line" had been fully reached and passed, the total receipts amounting to \$1,044,796. The receipts by collections only did not, of course, reach the million line, being \$932,209, a clear increase of \$95,616 from this source over 1886. There was, however, a large falling off in legacies. In 1886 they footed up \$133,958; this year only \$35,844, a decrease of nearly \$100,000. The other item of income—sundries—yielded this year \$76,743 against \$21,578 last year, the proceeds of the sale of a farm helping to account for the difference. The clear increase of the year's receipts over those of 1886 was \$52,667, which seems to promise that the million line can at least be held with proper effort. The return by Conferences shows that only fourteen Conferences exceeded the apportionment, though most of them exceeded the contributions of 1886. The fourteen Conferences which raised more than was asked from them were the Central Illinois, East German, Illinois, Idaho, Minnesota, Nebraska, Newark, North Dakota, North-west Iowa, North-west Swedish, Philadelphia, Southern California, South-west Kansas, and West Nebraska. Philadelphia is the banner Conference, raising upward of \$62,000. The next largest sum is \$44,586, credited to the New York East Conference.

The General Committee considered three different amounts as the basis of appropriations for the coming year. Secretary McCabe named \$1,100,000, which he thought was enough to ask of the Church, which desired a breathing-spell after its strenuous exertions. Bishop Fowler named \$1,200,000, holding that the Church would respond to that reasonable

advance. Dr. Hatfield named \$1,150,000 as a medium sum, and that figure was accepted, and the committee proceeded to make appropriations on the basis of that amount. The summary of appropriations was as follows: Foreign missions, \$635,628; Missions to foreigners in United States, \$71,272; Domestic missions and miscellaneous, \$494,921; total, \$1,201,819.

In connection with the discussion on the appropriations for Africa the fact was brought out that Bishop Taylor had returned the draft for \$1,000 sent him for new work among the heathen on the borders of Liberia, saying he was willing to administer for any established work of the society, but preferred not to undertake the opening of new work himself. The question of the bishop's salary was considered. The amounts heretofore appropriated as salary have been refused by the bishop. He is not willing to receive his salary from the missionary treasury, but desires to be paid as the other bishops are paid, from the Episcopal Fund. The majority of the committee agreed that appropriations should be made to him at the rate of \$3,000 a year, and accordingly \$12,000 was set apart for him for the quadrennium, including \$3,000 for 1888, and the amounts heretofore appropriated.

Bulgaria received much attention, as usual. Some of the committee thought the mission fulfilled the definition of a western mine—"a hole to put money into." Others thought the mission had never had a fair chance, and that it was important that the only Protestant mission north of the Balkans should be continued, however discouraging present circumstances might be.

**THE WORK OF THE AMERICAN BOARD.**—The annual meeting of the American Board, which was held after the contents of our November number were prepared, was more notable for its controversial than for its missionary character. Its sessions were so fully occupied with the ecclesiastical and doctrinal questions at issue that the missionary papers of the secretaries, which are a prominent feature of the board's anniversaries, were not read at all. The decisions on the matters at issue were, we may say in passing, such as the Congregational Churches anticipated, and gave general satisfaction, although it is felt that a reorganization of the Board, so as to bring its methods of administration more in accord with Congregationalism, is desirable, and as soon as the smoke of the present conflict clears away it is probable that steps will be taken to make the Board a representative Congregational society instead of a close corporation.

The annual survey notes an unprecedented increase in the number of young women who offered themselves during the year for missionary service. The missions in papal lands grow very slowly but steadily. There is more interest both in Mexico and Austria, though persecution continues. The missions in Turkey have been disturbed by the proselytizing labors of Baptists and Disciples of Christ, and some of the schools have been interfered with by government authorities. The churches are growing stronger and more self-reliant, and are becoming more and more

interested in extending evangelical influences. As to the missions in India, much is said of the importance of enlargement. There is a larger heathen population in India to-day, it is said, than when Gordon Hall landed there over sixty years ago. Over 3,000,000 Hindus are familiar with the English tongue. The missionary work has not kept pace with the growth of education and the change in religious belief. Much more money ought to be available for Christian schools. The Christian College in Japan, the money for which was subscribed at the annual meeting of the Board at Portland in 1874, in response to an appeal from a Japanese convert, has now over 300 students. Over sixty of these became Christians last year. Christianity is now a power in Japan. The missionary stage will soon be over if American and European Christians will respond liberally to the appeal of the present opportunities. The slow progress of Christianity in China will soon become, Secretary Smith thinks, a rapid progress.

The faithful labor of many years is at last taking effect upon the convictions of the Chinese rulers and people; the aim of this Christian work is better appreciated, and the public opinion of the outside world is beginning appreciably to affect the policy of this great empire.

The Board has, with the new men sent out, seventy-seven laborers in China, of whom twenty-five are ordained missionaries. There are four missions, the Foochow, North China, Shan-se, and Hong Kong. The last two are in pressing need of re-enforcement. In Africa the Zulu mission has had a very prosperous year. The new East Central Mission, on Inhambane Bay, 500 miles north of Durban, is hardly yet fairly established. The West Central Mission reports the baptism of fourteen young men at Bailundu, and the organization of a Church. The stations at Bihé and Benguela have several hopeful cases of inquiry.

The work in the Pacific Islands affords great encouragement. The Ponape incident, which we described in our November number, was followed by an insurrection of the Ponapeans, who expelled the Spaniards. The general summary of the Board shows that there are 22 missions, 89 stations, 891 out-stations, 166 ordained missionaries, with 291 other laborers, 155 native pastors, 393 native preachers and catechists, 1,164 native teachers, 325 other native helpers, 325 churches, 28,042 members, 55 high-schools and theological seminaries, with 3,623 pupils; 41 boarding-schools for girls, with 2,318 pupils; and 878 common schools, with 34,417 pupils. The additions to membership during the year were 2,906. The receipts of the Board from all sources, including a small balance in the treasury September 1, 1886, were \$680,954. Of this amount \$366,958 came by donations, \$98,414 by bequests, and upward of \$203,000 from the Otis and Swett legacies.

**THE MORAVIANS AMONG THE HOTTENTOTS.**—The Moravians have been observing the sesqui-centennial of the landing of the pioneer of Christian missions in South Africa, the Rev. George Schmidt. Schmidt was a remarkable man. He left Bohemia at the end of a six years' imprisonment

for conscience' sake to endure almost equal hardness in far-off Africa. He landed at Cape Town July 9, 1737, and soon after went to work among the Hottentots, perhaps the most despised people of Africa, at a place called Bavianskloof (Baboon's Glen), whence he was driven by the persecutions of the Dutch clergy in 1743. He was driven from the country, and not allowed to return. The Dutch Christians in those days did not regard the Hottentots as any thing more than dogs, and it is said that the inscription "Dogs and Hottentots not admitted" might frequently be seen over the doors of their churches. The Dutch masters would not allow their slaves to be baptized. Accounts had reached Herrnhut, in Saxony, of the sad state of the Hottentots, and it was these that fired the soul of George Schmidt, who was then only twenty-seven years of age. The examining committee sought to dissuade him from going to Africa. They said: "The language of the Hottentots is extremely difficult. They have nothing but wild roots to feed upon." But he was determined to go. "With God," he said, "all things are possible, and, as I have assurance that it is the will of God I should preach the Gospel to the Hottentots, so I hope firmly in him that he will carry me through the greatest difficulties." Arrived in Africa, he was treated with hostility by the Dutch from the first, but the Hottentots gathered about him and he taught them Dutch, and some of them were brought to a saving knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ and were baptized. The Dutch colonists would not, however, allow the Hottentots to become Christians, and Schmidt was forced to return to Europe, after six years of fruitful work, driven away by Protestants. These Protestants had no regard whatever for the Hottentots, except for the service to be got out of them, and they could even coolly contemplate the open seizure of their property without a qualm of conscience. In 1652 Governor Van Riebeck wrote in his journal:

The Hottentots came, with thousands of cattle and sheep, close to our forts, but we could not succeed in traffic with them. We feel vexed to see so many fine herds of cattle, and to be unable to buy to any considerable extent. If it had been allowed, we had opportunity enough to deprive them to-day of ten thousand head; which, however, if we obtain orders to that effect, can be done at any time, and even more conveniently, because they will by that time have greater confidence in us. With one hundred and fifty men, eleven thousand head of black cattle might be obtained without danger of losing one man; and many savages might be taken without resistance in order to be sent as slaves to India.

Such was the Christianity that drove Schmidt from his attempt to elevate the Hottentots. Not till 1792 was the mission renewed; and though nearly fifty years had elapsed since Schmidt's withdrawal, some of the fruit of his labors was found by those who came after him. The new missionaries were persecuted as Schmidt had been, and outrageously misrepresented. The good Dutch colonists even went so far as to say that if "missionaries come here to convert the Hottentots they ought immediately to be put to death." Near the close of the century the Boers in a memorial to the government demanded that the Moravians be not permitted to teach the Hottentots, for as there were many Christians in the country who were not instructed, it was not proper that the Hottentots

should be. The days of Dutch rule were, however, numbered, and under English protection the missionaries went on with their work. In 1797 a church was erected at Bavianskloof capable of accommodating several hundred hearers. At that time there were eighty-four baptized Hottentots in the community. The old name gave place to that of Genadendal (Vale of Grace), and in 1808 another station was established. From this beginning have grown the large mission interests of the Moravians in South Africa among Hottentots, Bushmen (an allied tribe), Kaffirs, and others. In Cape Colony and Kaffraria there are now sixteen stations besides out-stations, sixty missionary agents, and 12,300 converts. The old church is still standing at Genadendal, much dilapidated, but precious in memories. It was built by the natives themselves, and is plain and destitute of ornament as possible. As a memorial of the labors of Schmidt the natives propose to raise money enough for its renovation. On the festival day, July 9, in Genadendal alone \$350 were raised for this purpose, and it is hoped to have it ready for the celebration (in 1892) of the centenary of the renewal of the mission. A few years ago a faithful Hottentot minister, under whose labors many came to know and accept Christ, passed to his reward, one of the fruits of the work begun by George Schmidt, and one of the incontrovertible evidences that Hottentots, who used to be considered the lowest of human kind, may become intelligent and effective preachers of the Gospel.

**THE CATHOLIC ASSASSINS IN MEXICO.**—In our November number we gave an account of the murder of several native Protestants, including an ordained preacher, at Ahuacuatiitlan, Mexico. The latest information from the Rev. J. Milton Greene, D.D., of the Presbyterian mission in Mexico, to which the victims at Ahuacuatiitlan were attached, shows that the murderers are still unpunished. As soon as President Diaz heard of the affair he ordered the arrest of the chief of police, Cazares, and the priest, Vergara, believing that they were responsible for the plot. Cazares was removed from office, and Father Vergara and seven of those who were immediately concerned in the crime were arrested, but nothing further was done to bring them to trial. Accordingly, Dr. Greene wrote to President Diaz pleading for justice. In four days he received a reply promising to press the officials to action. After waiting two weeks longer Dr. Greene received information that two of the seven prisoners had been released on the payment of \$50 each, and were threatening the lives of the remaining members of the congregation. Vergara had also been released on the payment of \$100, and had resumed his priestly duties. At the same time the state government published a statement to the effect that witnesses who could identify and convict the prisoners could not be secured. An investigation of the facts showed that the judge in charge of the case had carefully avoided calling those who had witnessed the murders. On October 8, Dr. Greene had an interview with President Diaz, and told him how justice was being defeated, and submitted to him a list of fifty persons who were seen to take part in the

attack, together with a list of witnesses who were ready to testify. The president was indignant at the action of police and judiciary, and promised to do his utmost to have the miscreants brought to trial. Here the matter rested at last accounts. The Protestants are not very hopeful of a favorable issue. The president and governor of the State are anxious to have the murderers punished, but the local judges and officials will do all they can to screen them. Dr. Greene, as showing the trend of Catholic opinion, gives the following from an organ of Romanism in the city of Mexico, *La Defensa Católica*:

True charity consists in opposing our neighbor, injuring him in his material interests, abusing him and even taking his life whenever this may be necessary out of love to God. In the love and service of the Lord we ought, if necessary, offend men; we ought even to wound them and kill them; such acts are virtuous, and are permissible in the name of catholic charity.

UNDER the permissive legislation of the Northern and Southern Presbyterian General Assemblies of last May, the missions of the two Churches in Brazil have resolved to unite their organizations and form a single Church in Brazil. Similar action is expected in other countries.

IT is the general impression that the interior slave-trade of Africa is dying out; but the Rev. D. C. Scott, of Blantyre, East Africa, of the Church of Scotland mission, writes that it is making "frightful progress," at least in the Nyassa region. Caravan after caravan of Arabs goes into the interior from the east coast, and acre after acre of fair country is desolated, thousands are slaughtered, and thousands enslaved. Villages through which you might march straight on almost a day's journey, from one end to the other, are now deserted. The traffic was never more inhumanly conducted than now. "Missions need," says Mr. Scott, "to be multiplied, for they are a mighty foe to this barbarous business."

THE ENGLISH BAPTIST MISSIONARY SOCIETY has lost in its Congo field no fewer than fifteen of its missionaries, including two women, in the eight years of its occupancy of that region. Five others have been disabled, and are now serving elsewhere, making in all twenty out of thirty-six who have been laid aside. The most recent losses are those of Messrs. Whitley and Biggs, who died of fever.

THE English Baptist Society in retiring from the Cameroons Mission, West Africa, gave its right, title, and good-will to the Basle Society, which is carrying on the mission quite successfully on pedobaptist principles. Much trouble was anticipated with regard to baptism, but none has been encountered so far. As soon as the German missionaries were installed, one of the native evangelists came forward and of his own accord asked them to baptize the twins whom his wife had just given birth to. And then another native Christian, similarly situated, asked for the same favor. And thus without any difficulty and without a word of reasoning or expostulation, the native Christians seem to be ready to accept infant baptism.

**THE MAGAZINES AND REVIEWS.**

A CAREFUL study of the relation of the Roman Church to the American Republic ought to occupy the attention of the thoughtful. A writer in the *American Catholic Review* sees that, while the Roman Church is influencing America, America is equally influencing the Roman Church. The two influences, mediaeval and modern, react on each other with fairer ground and freer conditions than ever have been obtained before. The assertion is made, which will surprise many, that a majority of the seventy-six bishops are now American-born, and statistics are given to demonstrate the well-known fact that Roman Catholic families have the largest number of children. A striking proof, in the mind of the writer, of the liberalizing influence of American institutions, is in the bold bid made for the favor of the Knights of Labor by the episcopal influence, which prevented a condemnation of that order. He traces the defeat of English official influence with respect to the appointment of an Archbishop of Dublin to the opposing pressure of the whole American hierarchy. Proof is set forth to show that there was a widespread effort on the part of leading men of the hierarchy to turn the Irish Catholic vote over to Mr. Blaine; but the writer finds consolation in the belief that this plausible and plotting stage of the Catholic Church in America is essentially transient in its nature, and gives, as reasons for this opinion, the fact that the perfection of the machinery of the Catholic Church is itself a danger in the American mind; that there is almost as much dissent, agnosticism, and free thought among educated Catholics as among other people in America. The heart of the Catholic, however far his head may be from the Church, never pulls away from the candles, the incense, the chanting, the robe and perfumed ceremonial, even when his head most fully rejects the mysteries upon which these depend. He may go to mass infrequently and to confession not at all. The McGlynn case is a proof of the spirit of revolt rife in the ranks of the American priesthood. But the greatest danger to the American Church is held to be this: That all the protests of the people against foolish priests; all the complaints of the priests against despotic bishops; all the charges of the bishops against the clergy and communicants, must be referred to Rome for consideration. This is a very brilliant number of the *Review*.

It is difficult to read a single issue of the English reviews without finding at least one important article relating to the problems of American life. In the July *Edinburgh* a study of the international law of the United States occupies a prominent place. It is admitted that the United States have played a great part, and are yet destined to play a further part in the formation of modern international law. The international law of the United States is characterized by marked individuality and independence of thought. The statesmen of the republic have rested their discussions on clear principles, which they have enunciated without ob-

scurity and with perfect straightforwardness. The successive secretaries of state have been keen to see practical advantages, and have urged their views with ingenuity, sometimes with enthusiasm, always with dignity, power, and resolution.

There is a most thoughtful, conservative, and yet sympathetic article in this number on the education of women—a subject which occupies large space at present in English thought. It is strange that those who are ultra-conservative in this matter do not see that there is a steady advance in educational opportunities for women, as well as a larger number of occupations and professions opening to them yearly. The special object of attack in this paper is the opinion of the strenuous Dr. Maudsley, who argues that the vital energies of women are so heavily taxed that no further strain can be laid upon them.

Mr. Romanes, in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* of May last, has perhaps more strongly than any other writer, and certainly more fairly, declared that the theory that the mental faculties of the two sexes are identical is absurd, though he by no means denies that they may be equal, each having its own peculiar and distinctive qualities. Starting from the fact that the average brain weight of women is about five ounces less than that of men, he observes that we should expect a marked inferiority of intellectual power among women, and that this displays itself in a comparative absence of originality. The female intellect is essentially receptive, prompt, and subtle to take in all outward impressions. In no department of creative thought save fiction can women be said to have approached men. Some very important considerations are given in this paper concerning the bearing upon this fact of the education which has been permitted by men to be given to women. As a whole it is one of the most thoughtful and interesting discussions of the subject which we have seen.

Brander Matthews turns the tables upon English complaints, in his paper on "American Authors and British Pirates," and demonstrates that the English, in respect of pirating foreign authors, have been as great sinners as the Americans. Longfellow in 1876 wrote to a lady in England, who was groaning over American republication without compensation: "It may comfort you to know that I have had twenty-two publishers in England and Scotland, and only four of them ever took the slightest notice of my existence, even so far as to send me a copy of the books." Twenty years before that, Hawthorne visited a leading publishing house, and saw one of the firm who expressed great pleasure in seeing him, as he had published and sold (without any compensation of the author) uncounted thousands of his books. Emerson's works have been reprinted in England; the visit of Dr. Holmes to London called forth a mass of reprints; while Warne's *Star Series* contained in 1885 ninety-one numbers, and at least thirty-six of these were of American authorship; among them *The Wide, Wide World*, *The Prince of the House of David*, *That Lass o' Lowrie's*, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *Little Women*, and E. P. Roe's

stories. Another series, called Warne's *Selected Books*, contained nineteen numbers, and of these all but two were by American authors. Ward, Locke, and Tyler have their several series. One is the *Home Treasury Library*, and of the thirty-eight volumes of this series thirty were written by American authors. In another series there were seven American books, Mr. Beecher, Mr. Channing, J. T. Headley, T. T. Munger, and Professor William Matthews being the victims in this case. *The Good Tone Library* has twenty volumes, and all but three of these are of American authorship. *Little Women* is No. 15, and No. 16 is *Good Wives*, a sequel to the above. The author follows the British catalogue remorselessly, and shows what many have known before, but what up to this time has had no adequate setting forth, that the complaint of the English press is cant.

Those who are interested in the question, "What Kind of Wine was Used by the Master in the Lord's Supper?" will find President Hovey's discussion of the question, in the *Baptist Quarterly* for July, of considerable importance. He particularly discusses the phrase "fruit of the vine." He declares that he publishes his views reluctantly, for he expects that his devotion to what he believes to be the truth will cost him friends among those who hold a different opinion. His conclusions are, that the fact that Jesus did not use the word "wine," and did use the phrase "this cup," and "this fruit of the vine," does not favor the idea that the liquor was unfermented. The phrase "fruit of the vine" he holds to be a perfectly suitable designation of wine, and that only since it began to be believed that fermented grape-juice is poisonous has the discovery been made that wine is not the fruit of the vine. He holds, also, that the fact that the Jews were forbidden to use a leaven in any form during the passover does not prove that Jesus gave other than fermented grape-juice during the Lord's Supper, because no passage of Scripture forbids wine, or any kind of wine, to Jews during the passover. The Jews were commanded to remove all leaven from their borders during the passover week. Now, if in their minds leaven and fermentation were the same, it does not seem credible that midway between one vintage and the next all fermented juice of the grape was destroyed and that this destruction should never be expressly mentioned. We cannot give all the reasons for Dr. Hovey's opposition to modern theories in this respect, but the paper, whatever may be thought of his conclusions, is one well worthy the attention of thoughtful men.

We have found our neighbor, the *Catholic Magazine*, apart from its theology, with much of which we can have no sympathy whatever, a very bright and interesting publication. The second article is by Henry Haymen, D.D., upon a subject which is very interesting—"Cruel Nature." We have had so many studies of Mexico from Protestant stand-points that a study of its educational and industrial relations from the Catholic stand-point is of peculiar interest and value. A writer, reviewing an article in a recent issue of the *Forum* entitled, "For Better, for Worse," writes none too strongly of the scandal brought upon the marriage rela-

tions through the lax divorce laws of New England, but omits to state that the legislation of all the leading Churches almost as absolutely prohibits divorce as that of the Roman Catholic Church.

The October *Nineteenth Century* (L. Scott Publication Co., Philadelphia) naturally represents the preoccupation of the English mind with the Irish question, having articles by Gladstone, Dicey, and Hill on that or kindred subjects. Yet much of interest to American readers will be found in the study of Europe as revisited by Sir Salar Jung, in the story of "Dock Life in East London," and "Mr. Mivart's Modern Catholicism," by Justice Stephen.

Psychologists will find much of value in Mr. Gurney's "Letters on Phantasms," where some phases of thought-transference are discussed, and Mr. Gurney is not persuaded that they can be all accounted for by coincidence. Justice Stephen, in his trenchant way, shows that Mr. Mivart's views of the possibility of free thought in the Catholic Church are very wide of the mark—that his methods are destructive, for instance, of all faith in the incarnation. Mr. Mivart must not choose among his historical facts which he will believe. While the paper of Justice Stephen is not over-favorable to Christianity, it is yet worth something as a protest against "comprehension."

Robertson Smith reappears in the October *Contemporary* in an article on the "Date of the Pentateuch." Dr. Smith seems to be moving on in his negations of faith in the Old Testament, holding, contrary to many scholars, that recent Egyptian discoveries throw no light on the date of the Pentateuch. We fear that Robertson Smith's methods leave little basis for faith in the divine legislation of Moses, though we hear him speaking of "a miraculous guidance which made the Jewish race the sole depository of the religious truths on which Christianity is founded."

David A. Wells, an American writer, has a careful study of the fall of prices since 1873, which exhibits the best comparison of the purchasing power of money we have seen. The other papers are of scant interest.

Robert Ingersoll opens the November number of the *North American* with "The Agnostic Side," a reply to Rev. H. M. Field, D.D. It is painful to see Mr. Ingersoll fighting a Christianity which did exist, but which has never existed in Methodism, in the elements most condemned by him. How far he is astray in his conception of the Gospel appears in the following sentences: "Religion has been the enemy of the social order, because it directs the attention of man to another world. Religion teaches its votaries to sacrifice this world for the sake of another. The effect is to weaken the ties that hold families and states together." He seems to have forgotten all commands as to the shining light, diligence in business, caring for one's family. Wm. Hosea Ballou has a very good article on the "Possibilities of Animal Intelligence," maintaining with much force the thesis that animals are approaching man. In "Possible

Presidents" John Sherman is exploited as a coming man. John Ball, Jr., does not succeed in convicting Cardinal Gibbons of any very serious mistakes in his account of the evils which threaten modern civilization.

John G. Carlisle, in the October *Forum*, defends, and prophesies the continuance of, Democratic rule. Bishop Huntington shows the relations between education and lawlessness. He is not over-happy in the greater freedom of the schools in elective studies and school government. "If you would have respect for law appear in the life of a nation you must put it into the schools."

Professor E. J. V. Huiguinn has a remarkably interesting study of the Roman anathema, *apropos* of a recent excommunication. We commend it to the attention of our ministers.

The "Aim of Human Life," according to Professor J. Peter Lesley, is to "preserve order and practice good-will." Professor Lesley has much to say of the insufficiency of Christian orthodox motive, but he can do no better than give a Christian rule of conduct after all. His aim as here given is only another phrase for St. James's definition of pure and undefiled religion. Alice Wellington Rollins writes strongly in the "New Uncle Tom's Cabin," against the tenement house evil.

Congregationalism lends Prof. J. M. Hoppin to the Protestant Episcopal Church for the purpose of a thoughtful article in the September *Church Review* on "The Principles of Art." Prof. Kinloch Nelson, D.D., and Rev. Arthur Lowndes, M.A., both discuss in this number the relations of Anglicanism and the Scottish Kirk. Mr. Lowndes seems to be fully possessed of the succession fantasy, and, though an Englishman, desires the Protestant Episcopal Church to take on the name "The Church of America." No better thing could happen for Methodism and other denominations. The pretended unity of the "Church" would speedily be shown to be the empty thing it is. The Protestant and Catholic parties are exclusive of each other, and alliance between them must be at the expense of principle. Changing the name would hasten the perception of this fact, and much would be gained.

The *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October maintains its scholarly traditions splendidly. The article on the term "Son of Man" in the New Testament follows the teaching of the late Professor John Morgan, and is employed as an argument for the authenticity of the four gospels and for the divinity of Christ. Professor Schodde completes his translation of the "Book of Jubilees," and opens this very ancient book to the English reader for the first time. Rev. John Williams, of Chicago, unfolds the "New School Calvinistic Doctrine of Regeneration." It is interesting and fresh only as it shows how our Calvinistic brethren of Calvinistic antecedents still struggle with their bonds. Dr. Wm. DeLoss Love briefly distinguishes, in a strong paper, between Hades and Gehenna.

Hades to the righteous was a prison only as a body was a prison to the soul. That was the patristical view, and the Petrine and apostolical view. The primi-

tive saints believed that their salvation would not be complete until they were delivered from their detention in Hades. Hence they looked with great expectation to the resurrection, particularly until they received the idea that the souls of the righteous were to be transferred to be with their Saviour at the right hand of the Father. . . . Adding to this the fact that Gehenna of itself was not called a prison, but something far worse—a place of fire—we are further helped to the conclusion that Christ, preaching to the spirits in prison, did not preach to the impenitent dead. He did go to paradise, or Abraham's bosom, when he died, for he was to be there that day with the penitent one on the cross.

The *Andover* is well sustained in strength. In its October issue the Rev. Asher Henry Wilcox discusses "The Ultimate Criteria of Christian Doctrine." This he defines to be the common Christian consciousness:

This is the product of all that is most valuable in the Christian experience and knowledge of all Christendom. Here the idiosyncrasies of the individual are left behind, his errors corrected, his narrowness enlarged, his weakness made strong. . . . The individual Christian consciousness is modified, corrected, and aided by the common experience, the common feeling of the saints of the whole Church of God on earth.

He illustrates in conclusion the following points:

The common Christian consciousness as an interpreter of Scripture and of Scripture doctrine is universal in its influence. The common Christian consciousness as an interpreter of Scripture and Scripture doctrine is progressive. The common Christian consciousness, while continually interpreting and testing the Scriptures and Scripture doctrine, can never supersede them.

In the November *Andover* Rev. J. B. Heard writes "The Story of Three Panics, by One who has Lived through Them." The three are the papal aggression panic of 1850, in England; the second that which followed the publication of *Tracts for the Times*; the third came from the essays and reviews of Dr. Temple and others. He counsels the American Churches not to quake over fresh discussions of the old foundations. The editor is not wholly happy over the result of the great discussion at Springfield, Mass., of the relation of the American Board to the Churches. It would seem that the editors of the *Andover* hardly expected that the vote would be so heavily against the council project. But those who know the facts know that a small and able group of men may make a great deal of noise, and it is probable that the really influential minds who find a second probation for some necessary to their theodicy, are not more than five or six. The vote at the Springfield meeting shows what is well known to New England students, that the masses of the Congregationalist Church are untouched by the new theology.

A study of the article on "The Professional Education of Ministers" reveals the fact that many besides our Methodist fathers have had reason to fear that theological seminaries do not train pastors well. Yet in our own seminaries the objections here mentioned hold to a very slight degree.

The *Southern Methodist Review* for November has many good articles. One on "Unity Better than Union," by Rev. J. W. Hawley, states

strongly the difficulties in the way of organic union of Protestant bodies, while it insists that unity is not only a possibility, but a growing fact. As to union between the two great Episcopal Methodisms, the writer is not hopeful. He emphasizes the points of difference, and declares that the Church South cannot surrender its view of the episcopacy and other matters.

The *Catholic Review* is, from its own stand-point, always strong, and often has articles valuable to the Protestant Christian. Thus in the October issue the question, "Has Professor Huxley's Mission Been a Failure?" is ably discussed, and the conclusion given that the agnosticism of the professor is an avowed failure as an argument against Christianity. There is also a thoughtful paper on "Some Aspects of Private Fortunes," by G. W. Gilliam, LL.D., which shows how much danger to popular content and public welfare lies in large fortunes selfishly used. The other articles are chiefly of Roman Catholic interest, and some of them apologetic.

---

#### BOOK NOTICES.

##### RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

*Is there Salvation after Death?* A Treatise on the Gospel in the Intermediate State. By E. D. MORRIS, D.D., LL.D., Lane Theological Seminary. 8vo, pp. 252. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.

Dr. Morris won high reputation as a clear and able writer by his *Ecclesiology*, which is fully sustained by his timely treatise on the vexed question of probation after death. Fully apprehending the gravity of his theme, he brings the problem to "the testimonies of Scripture, the witness of Christian symbolism, the evidences drawn from Christian theology, and the tests of Christian experience." Recognizing the fact that it must be solved, if at all, not by speculative reasonings or by human feeling, but by the revealed word, he examines a series of particular passages, grouped in seven classes, which have a bearing on this topic. Of these groups he finds that those which speak of the "fullness and freeness of salvation," of "divine forgiveness," of the "limitations of punishment hereafter," and of "judgment after death," can only be claimed, at best, as furnishing inferential support to the dogma of future probation. But his searching examination of them shows that, properly understood, they do not justify such inferences as the advocates of that theory appear to draw from them. His investigation of passages supposed to directly affirm the disputed doctrine is dispassionate, candid, and, we may add, conclusive. This is emphatically true of the crucial text, 1 Pet. iii, 18-20. Frankly conceding that this passage is difficult, obscure, perhaps unfathomable, he ably exposes the astounding unreasonableness of building a theory which, if true, requires a complete reconstruction of Christian theology,

on a single text of uncertain import. As to what this text does mean the doctor modestly declines to determine by any exposition of it. He contents himself with a very sensible suggestion concerning what the apostle really meant by it. He then proceeds to show that the dogma, which totters to its fall without the support of St. Peter's word, has no prop in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, in the restoration of the son of the widow of Nain, or in certain words of our Lord concerning the destiny of unbelievers, all which have been alleged to teach it. Thus he exhibits the theory as sheer speculation, without any scriptural foundation.

Reviewing the "general testimony of Scripture," our author fails to find any thing that can be justly made to support the dogma in question. To the inferences drawn by its advocates from Paul's doctrine of the headship of humanity, he replies that our Lord's headship is not natural but spiritual, and based on the response of human faith to God's wondrous love. As to the claim that God's love and justice make a future probation necessary to their vindication, he fitly responds that men are no more competent to explain what those perfections require than they are to solve existing mysteries in the divine administration. So also of the work of the Holy Spirit, which is admitted on all sides to be indispensable to human regeneration, he shows that Holy Scripture uniformly represents it as provided for man as he is in the present life, and not as he is to be in the hereafter. With similar breadth of view and force of reasoning the doctor discusses the "witness of Christian theology" and the "witness of Christian experience," neither of which can fairly be made to testify favorably to this boldly-asserted theory.

The spirit of this admirable contribution to theological thought is not sharply dogmatic, but calm, and eminently judicial. There is no asperity in it. Its style is precise, vigorous, dignified, and clear. The scheme of the work is comprehensive, omitting nothing material to the question discussed, and it is skillfully wrought out. It is a volume which the advocates of the so-called progressive theology will find it easier to condemn than to answer with satisfaction to themselves. One cannot help regretting, however, that in an incidental allusion to Arminius Dr. Morris represents that great theologian as being one in doctrine with Pelagius; whereas, in his dissertation on the seventh chapter of Romans, Arminius, after stating the views of Pelagius as given by St. Augustine, expressly disavows them, and affirms that his own opinions are a signal confutation of the leading falsehood of the Pelagian heresy. When will Calvinistic theologians deal justly with Arminius?

*Of the Doctrine of Morality in its Relation to the Grace of Redemption.* By ROBERT B. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., LL.D. 12mo, pp. 331. New York: Thomas Whittaker. Price, \$1.50.

To minimize the value of Christianity some of its modern assailants exalt false religions by claiming, as Celsus in the third and the deists in the eighteenth century did, that its moral teaching is not peculiar to it, but is only a reproduction of moral precepts common to all religions. Dr. Fair-

bairn's book discusses this apparent objection. Admitting that the human soul is so constituted that its wants naturally lead it, when under its best conditions, to the perception of moral truth and to the development of a sense of duty to do those acts required by its relations to society, he proceeds to show that Christianity does not profess to reveal a special moral system, but only to explain and enforce those moral ideas which are more or less clearly taught by natural religion. What Christianity actually does is, to so unfold the relations of men to God and to each other that the nature and obligations of moral life are placed in a divine light, which broadens and deepens their moral perceptions and intensifies the action of the conscience. But its crowning achievement is its revelation of that redemptive grace by which alone an ideal moral life is possible. These views are very ably and vigorously wrought out by Dr. Fairbairn in this timely and thoughtful volume.

It is to be regretted, however, that in his "Introduction" he charges the Wesleyan revival with being the source of "a feeling adverse to morality, which has not yet faded out;" in other words, of Antinomianism. To support this indictment, the Doctor gives the authority of Lecky's *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*. Had he consulted such authorities as Tyerman's *Life of Wesley*, *Wesley's Journal*, or Stevens's *History of Methodism*, all which, on this question, are better guides than Lecky, he would have learned that the Wesleyan revival was as remarkable for its moral as for its spiritual results. Wesley insisted, from first to last, on right moral conduct as the indispensable fruit of a true spiritual life. He judged the professions of his converts more by the correctness of their morals in every-day life than by their utterances in the class-room. "I dread every approach to Antinomianism," he wrote: "I have seen the fruit of it over the three kingdoms." But it was not in his societies that this poisonous fruit was produced. It had its roots in the Solifidianism of the Moravians, in the Calvinistic dogmas of "imputed righteousness" and absolute predestination, and in the extravagant views of Christian perfection taught, not by himself, but by parties whom he censured, and who withdrew from his fellowship. It is indeed a matter of authentic history that, despite these incidental drawbacks (for which Wesleyanism was no more responsible than was the Pauline gospel for those Antinomians whose key-note was, "Let us sin that grace may abound"), the Wesleyan movement was eminently a moral revival. Besides raising up a numerous "people zealous of good works," it also produced a very marked reformation of manners throughout England. Then, as now, Wesleyanism, while strongly insisting that "without faith it is impossible to please God," also emphasizes the truth that "faith without works is dead."

*The Why of Methodism.* By DANIEL DORCHESTER, D.D. 16mo, pp. 182. New York: Phillips & Hunt; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 70 cents.

Will the time ever come when works on Methodist apologetics will cease to be written? Probably not, for as the changes in human thought make

Christian apologetics necessary, though nearly nineteen centuries have passed since Christianity began its work, so Methodism, for like reasons, will in every age be called upon to defend its right to be. This fact justifies Dr. Dorchester in writing *The Why of Methodism*, which, viewed as a brief and popular presentation of the question, is one of the best books of its class hitherto produced. In strong and pithy style it treats of the origin, the character, the influence, and the polity of Methodism. By vigorously seizing the salient points of these topics the doctor avoids prolixity, holds the attention, and impresses, if he does not always wholly capture, the judgment of his reader. His comparative statistics, which are given as tests of the success of Methodism and of the superior advantages of its polity, must have cost him very great labor, and they are, as a whole, quite conclusive. His valuable tabulations of the duration of what are called settled pastorates furnish him a ground for his belief that "the general extension of the term of Methodist pastorates" would not be productive of good. He nevertheless concedes that "possibly some exceptions in large cities might be made advantageously to the Church." Very good. But since his tables demonstrate that "in the whole country the average term of service in the Congregational churches for the settled pastors and stated supplies is only 3.8 years," it is a fair conclusion that there is no danger that our itinerant system would be imperiled if its present "time limit" were abolished. If with the policy of a settled pastorate a practical itinerancy is maintained, our system, itinerant in principle, would certainly be able to retain this its peculiar feature. Given, then, our plan of annual appointments by bishops having authority to reappoint as long as the exceptional needs of a given church and the special fitness of a pastor to meet them might require, its exceptional cases might be provided for without peril to the continuity of our itinerant plan. Human nature will always take care of the itinerancy.

*The Scottish Pulpit, from the Reformation to the Present Day.* By WILLIAM M. TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D., Minister of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City; Author of *Peter the Apostle*, etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo, pp. 287.

This is a volume of sketches addressed to the students of Yale Theological Seminary in 1886. Its first chapter is "Introductory and Historical," and contains a lucid synopsis of the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland from the beginning of its struggle with the Papacy down to the grand and memorable disruption of 1843. This is succeeded by graphic sketches of John Knox, who never feared the face of man; of Melville, the educator, who "made Scotland Presbyterian;" of Rutherford, who was as sharp in controversy as he was saintly in character; of Dickson, the noted revivalist; of Livingstone, "the most popular preacher of his time," and specially distinguished for one sermon which won five hundred sinners to Christ; of Archbishop Leighton, whose writings are still in demand because of the beauty of their style, the appositeness of their illustrations, their devout spirit, and their rich stores of theological thought. After these come glimpses of the leaders of the unevangelical Moderate Party.

Next we are shown Chalmers, the most powerful preacher of the modern Scottish pulpit, and in no mean sense the restorer of the evangelical spirit to the Scottish Church. Its final chapter briefly describes the representative men of the Dissenting Churches in Scotland. In all these sketches Dr. Taylor has broadly outlined the leading facts in each man's life, pointed out the sources of his influence, and noted the characteristic features of his preaching. Hence, though he does not theorize on homiletics, he practically illustrates homiletical principles. His plain style is strong, vigorous, and clear. His apt use of personal anecdotes makes his pages as entertaining as they are instructive.

*Christian Facts and Forces.* By NEWMAN SMYTH, Author of *Old Faiths in a New Light*, etc. 12mo, pp. 267. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1 50.

Dr. Smyth is no preacher of smooth things, nor a writer of dull, meaningless platitudes. On the contrary, he hurls ethical truths upon slumbering consciences with a force born of deep moral convictions and clear intellectual perceptions. His style is characterized by a nervous strength and rhetorical attractiveness which command and hold the reader's attention. There are twenty discourses in this volume, mostly on themes suggested by current thought and passing events. These topics are treated more in view of their bearing on practical life and Christian experience than of their relations to speculative beliefs. Yet their author does not conceal his sympathy with the dogmas of the "New Theology." He suggests, without positively asserting, the idea of universal salvation. His "Study of the Atonement" presents a view of that mysterious doctrine which he assuredly did not find either in Paul's discussion of it or in the sayings of our Lord. He affirms that Christ, by "*identifying himself with our sinful consciousness*, makes a perfect repentance for sin and confession of it to the Father. Christ *experiences our sin* and confesses it." And again, "Christ realizes the cost of the sin of the world. . . . Thus God can be satisfied in forgiving and forgetting our sins. . . . And that which satisfies God himself will be sufficient to meet any demands of his law or necessities of his moral government."

This, it must be confessed, is very plausible; but who can understand how Christ could "*identify himself with our sinful consciousness . . . and experience our sins?*" That he could suffer as the representative of humanity is a comprehensible fact, as it is also that in his momentary sense of being forsaken by the Father he "*tasted death for every man*," it being understood that conscious separation from God is the essence of the "second death," which is *the punishment of sin*. But how he who "*knew no sin*" could have *consciousness and experience* of our sins who can explain? It may be clear to Mr. Smyth. To us Peter's statement that he "*suffered the just for the unjust*," and John's sublime declaration, that "*he is the propitiation for our sins*," are far better and more satisfactory statements of the philosophy of his wonderful act of self-sacrifice. Nevertheless, the volume, despite these few "*dead flies*," is, as a whole, exceedingly interesting, eminently suggestive, and full of living thoughts.

*The Biblical Illustrator*; or, Anecdotes, Similes, Emblems, Illustrations, Expository, Scientific, Historical, and Homiletic, gathered from a wide range of Home and Foreign Literature, on the verses of the Bible. By Rev. JOSEPH S. EXELL, M.A. 8vo, pp. 688. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. \$2.

The motto of Sir Henry Wotton, "I am but a gatherer and disposer of other men's stuff," is applicable to Mr. Exell, whose work is well described by its title. The present lusty volume is devoted to St. Matthew's gospel, which is profusely illustrated and explained, verse by verse, with apposite, varied, and suggestive extracts from a vast number of ancient and modern authors. The meaning of words, the lessons deducible from the text, the doctrine it teaches, the duty it enjoins, pithy remarks of commentators and other writers upon it, and anecdotes with which to enforce its teachings, follow each verse. The author generally displays sound judgment, good taste, and wide acquaintance with the best writers, both of the past and present. He has put the condensed substance of many commentaries into one, giving the results reached by many learned exegetes, and has thereby produced a volume of great practical value, not to preachers only, but also to Sunday-school teachers, and to all, indeed, who take delight in searching the Scriptures.

*According to Promise*; or, The Lord's Method of Dealing with His Chosen People. A new book by CHARLES H. SPURGEON. A companion volume to *All of Grace*. 12mo, pp. 130. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 75c.

These twenty practical discourses of the most popular preacher of his time in England invite one to inquire, What are the sources of Spurgeon's popularity? The homilies suggest that it is neither displayed learning, depth of reasoning, brilliant rhetoric, nor great breadth of thought, but simplicity of statement, homely, well-chosen illustrations, pithy and quaint sentences, brief discriminating expositions, earnest persuasiveness, restrained yet deep spiritual feeling, and direct appeals to men's common sense, which give Mr. Spurgeon his strong hold upon the public mind. Excepting the homily on "Whose are the Promises?" in which the dogmas of an almost effete Calvinism are very distinctly set forth, a Christian reader will find much in this volume to quicken his affections, stimulate his faith, encourage his hope, and feed his spiritual aspirations.

*The Story of the Psalms*. By HENRY VAN DYKE, D.D., Pastor of the Brick Church in New York; Author of *Reality of Religion*. 12mo, pp. 259. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1 50.

Every lover of the Psalms of David—and what Christian is not?—will be interested in this volume, which is expository, practical, and illustrative of the occasion and spirit of many portions of "the Hebrew Hymn-book." Dr. Van Dyke is an attractive and able writer. With admirable skill and judgment he draws out the lessons of the Psalms, associating them with the events in David's life which inspired their composition. His book is eminently religious in its tone, and is therefore a fitting companion for the Christian in his hours of retirement and reflection. It also abounds in thoughtful observations on Christian life and duty.

*The Lesson Commentary on the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1888.* By Rev. JOHN H. VINCENT, D.D., and Rev. WESLEY O. HOLWAY, M.A., U. S. N. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 8vo, pp. 351. Price, \$1 25.

Our first thought, after a brief examination of this volume, was that it is a marvel of cheapness ; our second, one of almost unqualified admiration of its contents. Lucid in its exposition of the text, pointed in its practical reflections, and cogent in its application of the truths taught, it is a very valuable aid to the teacher. Its pictorial illustrations are also good, but often lose much of their artistic effect from not being, to use a printer's phrase, *well made ready*. A little more care here would have made the book indeed admirable.

Question Books in three grades, adapted to the Commentary, are also on sale, price fifteen cents each.

---

#### PHILOSOPHY, METAPHYSICS, AND GENERAL SCIENCE.

*Philosophy of Theism.* By BORDEN P. BOWNE, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University; Author of *Metaphysics, Introduction to Psychological Theory*, etc. 8vo, 269 pp. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Sir William Hamilton designates philosophy an "intellectual gymnasium." He truthfully affirms that "philosophy lies at the basis of all theological science worthy of the name;" and speaking of it historically says, that sometimes perverting the simplicity of Christian faith, it has often come to its rescue and beaten back the hosts of infidelity and error. If through philosophy the Germans have been seduced from evangelical truth, by philosophy they are returning to it. Thought encounters thought, speculation wages war with speculation, till at last truth emerges from the strife vigorous and triumphant. . . . On which ground we vindicate the amplest and freest discussion in the domain both of religion and philosophy.

Viewed in this light Professor Bowne's *Philosophy of Theism* is a timely and valuable contribution to the interests of Christianity; timely, because in this age of mental activity men will think—indeed cannot help thinking. And to think is to philosophize, rightly or wrongly. The present volume philosophizes rightly as well as ably, and is in this sense an antidote to much of the abounding false philosophizing of the times.

Professor Bowne evidently has a genius for philosophy. His intellectual insight is deep, his perceptions clear, his concepts distinct, his logical faculty remarkably strong, and his verbal expression concise and forcible. To these qualities is joined another that is rarely found in philosophical writers; namely, a mildly sarcastic wit blended with a touch of humor. This quality both invigorates and enlivens his style, so that his work is, with all its profundity, positively entertaining. To be convinced of the truth of this latter remark one only needs to read the "Introduction" to this lucidly written volume, in which he wittily and logic-

ally brushes aside certain theories which lie in the foreground of his theme.

Our author seeks "the rational foundation of the theistic idea" in the theistic consciousness of the race. He finds it in "the demand of our entire nature, intellectual, moral, aesthetic, and religious." Very judiciously, he "does not propose to prove the divine existence, or to clear up all the puzzles of metaphysics," but only to show "that without a theistic faith we must stand as dumb and helpless before the deeper questions of thought and life as a Papuan or Patagonian before an eclipse."

In working his way to this conclusion the professor discusses, 1. The Unity of the World-Ground; 2. The World-Ground as Intelligent; 3. The World-Ground as Personal; 4. The Metaphysical Attributes of the World-Ground; 5. God and the World; 6. The World-Ground as Ethical; 7. Theism and Life. In his discussion of these several theories our author speaks confidently where confidence is justifiable, but is singularly frank in admitting whatever force he can find in anti-theistic arguments. It is not necessary to affirm that his logic is in every instance impregnable, but it is simply true to say that he satisfactorily proves that, as Morrell observes in his *History of Modern Philosophy*, "if there be any such thing as truth at all, if there be any common principles on which the human reason can rest, then assuredly the universe has a ground, or cause, and that cause is self-existent, absolute, infinite, eternal."

*The Science of Thought.* By F. MAX MULLER. No Reason without Language. No Language without Thought. Two vols., 12mo, pp. 656. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$4.

These volumes, as the learned author informs us in his Preface, are an amalgam composed of his earlier views and the results of his later labors. He gives this work to the world because "it is the result of a long life devoted to solitary reflection and to the study of the foremost thinkers of all nations, and contains certain truths which deserve to be recorded." Its special value lies in the fact that in it Müller carries the results of his profound linguistic studies into the realm of modern philosophic thought. Hence in the first volume we find him discussing, with his usual lucidity of expression, The Constituent Elements of Thought; Thought and Language; Kant's Philosophy; Language the Barrier between Man and Beast; The Constituent Elements of Language, and The Origin of Concepts and Roots. The second volume is devoted to The Roots of Sanskrit, the Formation of Words, and Propositions and Syllogisms. His aim in the chapter on "The Constituent Elements of Thought" is to establish the proposition that what we call reason is simply our power of "gathering and combining;" a process which "begins with sensation and passes on to perception and conception, and reaches its full perfection only when it has become incarnate in the Logos, or Word." The basic principle of this proposition is, that there is "no reason without language." In defending this principle he reviews the theories of Mill, Whately, Lotze, Locke, Abelard, Hume, Leibnitz, Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer,

Hamilton, Mansel, etc., showing how nearly most of these philosophers came to it, but without giving it such definite and exact expression as he does himself. In treating of "thought and language," Müller, after claiming that "both philosophy and philology have established the fact that language is thought and thought is language," proceeds to argue the proposition that "the true history of the human mind is to be found in the history of language." The beginning and growth of language being involved in this argument, he is led to discuss the question of its evolution, and also of evolution in general. In doing this he rejects the theory of Darwin, and claims as an established fact "that the whole genus man possesses something—namely, language—of which no trace can be found in the most highly developed animal, and that therefore a genealogical descent of man from animal is an impossible assumption." He next gives a brief view of Kant's philosophy, which he presses into a support of his theory. In chapter four he renews his assault on Darwin, and says of human speech: "If there is something in men which could not possibly have been inherited from a monkey or any other animal—something of which the most rudimentary germs are absent in the whole animal genus—something which has imparted to man a character entirely different from all other living beings, namely, language—why represent him as the descendant of an unknown, but certainly speechless, ape?" Having swept aside the philosophical objections to his theory of words as related to concepts, our author enters upon the more strictly philological portions of his work, which, it is needless to say, he treats with unsurpassed skill and full mastery of his subject. Evidently, Müller is a philologer who has learned to philosophize.

---

#### HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

*Brief Institutes of General History.* Being a Companion Volume to the Author's Brief Institutes of our Constitutional History, English and American. By E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS, D.D., LL.D., Professor of History in Brown University. 12mo, pp. 440. Boston: Silver, Rogers & Co.

This book is as unique and comprehensive in its plan as it is skillful and scholarly in execution. Unlike ordinary histories, it does not record the events of the ages in detail, but gives what the author correctly calls a "precipitate" of them, which "renders prominent the rationale of historical movement." Important details and distinguished characters are treated of in notes which are marvels of condensation. Each of its sixteen chapters is preceded by a select bibliography of exceeding value to every student seeking full acquaintance with the literature of the period under consideration. As a help to teachers of history, as a guide and text-book for historical students, and as a book of reference, it merits the highest praise. Its author is evidently deeply learned in the lore of history, and the book contains the keys which open the doors that lead to an understanding, not of history only, but also to the philosophy of history.

*The Boy Travelers on the Congo.* Adventures of Two Youths in a Journey with Henry M. Stanley through the Dark Continent By THOMAS W. KNOX, author of *Boy Travelers in the Far East*, etc. Illustrated. Quarto, pp. 463. New York: Harper & Brothers.

This attractive volume is a condensation of Stanley's *Through the Dark Continent*. Colonel Knox prepared it for the benefit of youthful readers at the request of Stanley himself. That Mr. Knox did this is sufficient assurance that it is well done—that intelligent young people will read it with avidity. The number of its illustrations is "legion," their artistic merit superior, their realism unquestionable, because they were drawn or photographed from the scenes and persons represented. It is one of the books which both fascinate and instruct. It is, in truth, a sort of wonder-book, revealing the secrets of the long unknown "dark continent" to the eager curiosity of the young concerning things strange and unlike to the familiar objects of their native land. To parents who are inquiring, "What book shall we give our children this holiday season?" it is safe to reply, "Give them *The Boy Travelers on the Congo*."

*A History of the Negro Troops in the War of the Rebellion, 1861-1865.* Preceded by a Review of the Military Services of Negroes in Ancient and Modern Times. By GEORGE W. WILLIAMS, LL.D., Colonel and late Judge Advocate in the Grand Army of the Republic; Author of the *History of the Negro Race*. 12mo, 353 pp. New York: Harper & Brothers.

This extremely interesting volume demonstrates, from the official records of the war of the rebellion, that the negro displayed in that protracted struggle the highest qualities of a soldier in many a hard-fought battle. Courage to attack, bravery to endure, fearlessness under deadly fire, and daring in assault, were as conspicuous in him as in the bravest and best of his white fellow-soldiers. That these qualities should be found in men belonging to a race long enslaved and generally despised is evidence that there is in the race a moral and intellectual basis for the highest culture. All that men have attained they may attain. Colonel Williams, who is himself a colored man, proves by his book that he can guide the pen with skill, force, and sound judgment. In its sixteen chapters he tells us what the negro has done as a soldier, both in ancient and modern times; and he has done this in a style and spirit and with a degree of intelligence which make his volume eminently readable, instructive, and historically valuable.

*Memoirs of Wilhelmine, Margravine of Bayreuth.* Translated and Edited by Her Royal Highness, Princess Christian of Schleswig-Holstein, Princess of Great Britain and Ireland. With Portrait. 16mo, pp. 454. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The fact that Wilhelmine was sister to Frederick the Great is sufficient of itself to kindle a desire in every lover of history to read what she wrote concerning a life passed in association with the court of that heartless monarch and his narrow-minded father. Her almost tragic story is profoundly interesting. Being autobiographic, it unfolds both the external events of her life and many of her mental struggles caused by

the ambition of her father and mother to bring about her marriage with the heir to the crown of Great Britain. She wrote of those trials with a guileless frankness which captures one's sympathies. Her memoirs show us a princess nobly born, and yet cruelly tried by intrigues that counted her affections as of no consequence when weighed against the supposed need of the kingdom of Prussia to increase its importance through her marriage with the heir of England's crown. Those intrigues were baffled, and she was almost forced to marry a German prince with whom she was scarcely acquainted, but whom, fortunately, she was subsequently able to love. Her narrative does not touch the last fifteen years of her life; but her letters to Voltaire, now in course of translation, will form a sequel to it. The volume, apart from its historical value, illustrates those much-despised words of the Master of Wisdom which affirm that "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."

*Engravings on Wood by Members of the Society of American Wood-Engravers.*  
Introduction and Descriptive Letter Text, by W. M. LAFFAN. Large folio.  
Ornamental covers. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$12.

Whoever thinks that American engravers on wood are in any sense inferior to those of France, Germany, and England needs only to examine this magnificent folio to be convinced that he is much mistaken. More than this, he will be compelled to confess that they have attained the pre-eminence in this admirable art. Here are twenty-five engravings from paintings so highly wrought, so exquisitely finished, so deep in tone, so rich in color, and so vigorous in expression as to be almost as pleasing and effective as engravings on steel. They are by Bernstrom, Closson, Cole, Davis, French, Johnson, King, Kingsley, Krull, Muller, Powell, Putnam, Tinkley, Wellington, and Wolf. The Harpers never produced a work more mechanically beautiful in execution than this. We question whether any other establishment in America could equal it. It is in truth a masterpiece both of wood-engraving and printing, and is a tasteful and fitting ornament for either the library or drawing-room table. It is just the thing for persons seeking something unique and elegant for a Christmas or New Year gift.

*Beauty Crowned; or, The Story of Esther, the Jewish Maiden.* By Rev. J. N. FRAUDENBURG, Ph.D., D.D., Member of the American Oriental Society, etc., Author of *Witnesses From the Dust*, etc. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 12mo, pp. 264. 90 cents.

This is not a superficial reproduction of the beautiful monograph of Esther contained in Holy Writ, but a carefully and tastefully written version of that charming story, in which its realism is illustrated by weaving into it many facts from classical and Oriental histories which go to prove even its minute truthfulness. These facts, with descriptions of many ancient customs, are not so presented as to rob the story of its charm, but rather to explain its allusions, and thereby add to its value as a part of the biography of a woman who played a very important part

in the history of her people. Hence it has both literary and historical value, and is a commendable addition to the list of works written for the entertainment and instruction of young people.

---

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

*The Wonder Clock*; or, Four-and-twenty Marvelous Tales, being one for each hour of the day. Written and Illustrated by HOWARD PYLE. Embellished with Verses by KATHARINE PYLE. Quarto, pp. 318. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The Messrs. Harper have sent out many good things for the entertainment of the young folk, but it may well be doubted whether they have ever provided a feast better adapted to meet their demand for "the evening hour" reading than this stately volume. Mr. Pyle is both a fabulist and a teller of fairy-stories. He uses natural objects, animals, and imaginary personalities as instruments to afford amusement and to teach moral lessons without moralizing. His humorous pictorial illustrations add not a little to the charm of the book, as do also the playful verses which precede each story. As a holiday gift-book it must be popular. Lads and misses will devour it, and the little ones too young to read it themselves will clamor to have it read to them.

*Animal Life in the Sea and Land*. A Zoölogy for Young People. By SARAH COOPER. Illustrated. 12mo, pp. 413. New York: Harper & Brothers.

To lure young people to a habit of observing, and to the formation of a taste for studying natural history, is to do them substantial and lasting good. To this end the volume before us is judiciously adapted. Eschewing formal scientific descriptions of the objects of animated nature, it is nevertheless based on scientific classification. Beginning with sponges, the lowest forms of animal life, it proceeds upward to man, the crown of the animal kingdom, describing not the minute parts of living objects, but those which are readily found by the unassisted eye, and such of their habits as can be most easily observed. This is done in clear, well-chosen language, which is made still more intelligible by two hundred and seventy-eight illustrations most admirably engraved and finely printed. It belongs to that class of useful and entertaining books of which it may be said that too many of them cannot be put into the hands of young people.

*Young Knights of the Cross*. A Hand-book of Principles, Facts, and Illustrations for Young People who are Seeking to Win the Golden Crown of Pure and Noble Character. By DANIEL WISE, D.D. 12mo, pp. 270. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe.

Dr. Wise intends this book to be a *vade mecum* for youth just entering their teens—a work to guide their conduct and teach them what is the right thing to do in the play-ground, the school, the home, the place of business, and wherever else they may be called to act.

# THE BEREAN LESSON SYSTEM.

Rev. J. H. VINCENT, D.D., Editor.

## ANNOUNCEMENT FOR 1888.

**THE STUDY.** A quarterly publication, designed for superintendents, primary-class teachers, normal-class conductors, and advanced workers generally. Price, 50 cents per annum.

**THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL JOURNAL.** Greatly enlarged and improved. The very best help for teachers and older scholars in the study of the lessons. Price, 60 cents per annum. Six copies and upward to one address, 50 cents each.

**THE SENIOR LEAF.** Price, 20 cents per year. Contains responsive readings, questions for senior students, and a variety of helpful hints, engravings, Bible Dictionary, etc.

**THE BEREAN LEAF.** Price, 6 cents per year. Every thing that the scholars from ten to sixteen years of age require will be found in this lesson leaf.

**THE BEGINNER'S LEAF.** Price, 6 cents per year. Containing questions for the younger scholars.

**THE LEAF CLUSTER** is an ornament to the walls of the school-room, as well as a valuable help in the teaching of the lesson to the little ones. The pictures are brilliantly illuminated. Issued quarterly. Price, \$5 per annum. A subscription to THE LEAF CLUSTER entitles the subscriber to a copy of THE STUDY free of charge.

**THE PICTURE LESSON PAPER,** for infant classes. Tinted paper, beautiful engravings, questions for the little people, lesson stories, etc. Price, 25 cents per annum. Six copies and upward to one address, 20 cents each.

*Sample copies of the periodicals sent free on application.*

## QUESTION BOOKS.

**The Senior Lesson Book,** for adult scholars. Price, 15 cents.

**The Berean Question Book,** for scholars from 10 to 16 years old. Price, 15 cents.

**The Berean Beginner's Book,** for children just above the infant class, though it may readily be used in that department. Price, 15 cents.

## COMMENTARIES.

**The Lesson Commentary,** by Dr. J. H. Vincent and the Rev. W. O. Holway, M.A., U.S.N., contains full notes and explanations upon all the lessons. Svo. Price, \$1 25.

**Whedon's Commentary on the New Testament.** Vol. I. Matthew and Mark. Price, \$1 50.

**Whedon's Commentary on the Old Testament.** Vol. III. Book of Joshua. By D. Steele, D.D. Books of Judges to 2 Samuel. By M. S. Terry, D.D. 12mo. Price, \$2 25.

**The People's Commentary on the New Testament.** By Amos Binney and Daniel Steele, D.D. 12mo. Price, \$3.

## MAPS.

**Map of Holy Land.** No. 2. Size, 55x72 inches. Price, \$5.

**Map of Palestine.** No. 4. Size, 120x80 inches. Price, \$10.

**Map of Scripture World.** Size, 55x72 inches. Cloth. Price, \$5.

**Illustrated Radial Key Map of Palestine** for first six months of the Lessons. On strong manilla paper. Price, 50 cents.

PHILLIPS & HUNT, Publishers, 805 Broadway, N. Y.  
CRANSTON & STOWE, Cincinnati.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS.

---

### The Life of William Morley Punshon, LL.D.

By the Rev. F. W. MACDONALD, Professor of Theology, Handsworth College, Birmingham, Author of *Fletcher of Madeley*, etc. With Etched Portrait. In demi 8vo. Price \$3.

Mr. Macdonald's life of Dr. Punshon has been eagerly looked for in the Methodist churches, and throughout the still wider circles to which the reputation of the eloquent preacher and lecturer extended. This biography has been written at the request of Dr. Punshon's family and executors, and the whole of his private papers have been placed in Mr. Macdonald's hands. Consequently it has not been anticipated by any memorials in sketches that have already appeared.

### The Pilgrim's Progress from this World to that which is to Come.

By JOHN BUNYAN. With one hundred illustrations by Frederick Barnard. Engraved by Dalziel Brothers. Square 4to, 9x11 inches. \$3.

### Thoughts of My Dumb Neighbors.

By MARY E. BAMFORD. 12mo, 70 cents.

### The Summer at Heartease.

By SOPHIA WORTHINGTON. 12mo, 90 cents.

### Golden Opportunities in Every-day Life.

By Mrs. C. M. METCALF. 12mo, 90 cents.

### Royalized.

By REESE ROCKWELL. 12mo, \$1 50.

### Self-Reliance Encouraged.

For Young Ladies. By JAMES PORTER, D.D. 12mo, \$1.

### Gurnett's Garden, and The New Boy at Southcott.

By Mrs. MARY E. BALDWIN. 12mo, \$1.

### Thorn-Apples.

By EMILY HUNTINGTON MILLER. 12mo, \$1.

**PHILLIPS & HUNT,**

**805 Broadway, New York.**

**CRANSTON & STOWE, CINCINNATI.**

### The Modern Sunday-School.

By JOHN H. VINCENT. 12mo. \$1.

*The Modern Sunday-School* contains some of the best results of Dr. Vincent's long experience and study in connection with the Sunday-school work. It contains chapters on "The Three Schools," "The School and the Church," "The School and the Home," "Organization," "The Superintendent," "The Teacher," "The Normal Class," "The Institute," "The Teachers' Meeting," "The Teacher at Work," "The Lesson," "The Review," "Gradation," "The Primary Class," "The Senior Class," "Lessons," "The Week-day Power," "The Country Sunday-school," and very full and rich appendixes. The suggestions in the body of the book and in the appendixes for instructing and entertaining young people are in themselves worth the cost of the book.

### Foreign Tourists' Series.

In pamphlet form. Compiled by MRS. E. H. THOMPSON. Paper covers. 12mo. Single, 5 cents. For 25, \$1.

The series contains fifty numbers, each devoted to a description of some historic city or locality which every European traveler is expected to visit. Mrs. Thompson has prepared these little volumes not only from the treasure-house of her own memory, but has enriched them with quotations from illustrious sources. Interesting facts are pleasantly alternated with bits of verse from Scott, Gray, Pope, Drayton, and others, and the impressions which such eminent travelers as Irving, Bayard Taylor, Humboldt, Hawthorne, and Mrs. Stowe have set down in their own books are here appropriately credited. With each volume are bound a few blank leaves, which can be utilized for personal notes.

- |                         |                        |                          |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Florence.            | 17. Chester.           | 33. Versailles.          |
| 2. Naples.              | 18. Stratford.         | 34. Cork.                |
| 3. Milan.               | 19. Windsor.           | 35. Lakes of Killarney.  |
| 4. Venice.              | 20. Liverpool.         | 36. Dublin.              |
| 5. Vesuvius.            | 21. The English Lakes. | 37. County Wicklow.      |
| 6. Pompeii.             | 22. Canterbury.        | 38. Belfast.             |
| 7. Rome—Part I.         | 23. Brighton.          | 39. The Coast of Antrim. |
| 8. Rome—Part II.        | 24. North Wales.       | 40. Chamouni.            |
| 9. Pisa.                | 25. Edinburgh.         | 41. Geneva.              |
| 10. Genoa.              | 26. Abbotsford.        | 42. Brussels.            |
| 11. London.             | 27. The Trosachs.      | 43. Antwerp.             |
| 12. Westminster Abbey.  | 28. Ayr.               | 44. Berlin.              |
| 13. The British Museum. | 29. Glasgow.           | 45. Dresden.             |
| 14. Oxford.             | 30. Inverness.         | 46. Cologne.             |
| 15. Cambridge.          | 31. Paris—Part I.      | 47. Frankfort.           |
| 16. York.               | 32. Paris—Part II.     | 48. Munich.              |
|                         | 49. The Rhine.         | 50. Vienna.              |

PHILLIPS & HUNT, Publishers, 805 Broadway, N. Y.  
CRANSTON & STOWE, Cincinnati.

THEOLOGICAL  
**Encyclopædia and Methodology.**

BY

**GEO. R. CROOKS, D.D., and JOHN F. HURST, D.D.**

Svo. Price, \$3.

The Publishers have received the following notices of this volume of the Biblical and Theological Library, in addition to those already given. They are chiefly from well-known divines who are engaged in teaching theology.

*From Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, Prof. of Biblical Literature in Union Seminary, N. Y.*

I have already recommended Crooks and Hurst's *Hagenbach* to my students in my lectures on Encyclopædia. It is, in fact, the only book in the English language, so far, which answers the purpose.

*From the Rev. S. L. Bowman, S.T.D., Dean of the School of Theology, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.*

I am greatly pleased with the excellence and completeness of this scholarly work. My appreciation of its merits may be best expressed by saying that, in organizing the curriculum for the School of Theology in De Pauw University, I have assigned it to a *first place* in that course of study.

*From Harper's Magazine.*

A vast variety of carefully sifted knowledge on manifold topics is summed in about six hundred pages, designed to afford a useful hand-book and guide to the scholar's inquiries. The catalogues of the literature of the various departments added by the American editors, while of course not complete, are yet full enough to prove of great help to most investigators.

*From Professor T. A. Penton, Pacific Theological Seminary, Oakland, Cal.*

I consider the book a remarkable production, doing honor to the skill and learning of the authors and to the courage and enterprise of the publishers. I heartily wish it could be placed in the hands of every theological student in the land.

*From the Reformed Quarterly Review.*

The "Encyclopædia and Methodology" is a valuable contribution to American and English theology. The subjects considered are all treated with great ability, and the work is in every respect a most excellent one.

*From the Rev. Dr. H. M. Scott, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Chicago Theological Seminary.*

The "Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology," by Drs. Crooks and Hurst, based on *Hagenbach*, is in every way to be recommended to the American theological public. The valuable and indispensable book of *Hagenbach* is not merely given us in American dress, but the additions and adaptations make it well-nigh an independent authority. I notice some slight inaccuracies—for example, in some of the classes of German periodicals—but have not met any thing to detract appreciably from the general value of the book, which is lasting and great.

PHILLIPS & HUNT, Publishers, 805 Broadway, N. Y.

CRANSTON & STOWE, Cincinnati and Chicago





# Our Youth—1888.

JOHN H. VINCENT, LL.D., Editor.



## FIVE SERIALS

BY

Kirk Munroe,      Mary Lowe Dickinson,  
Karl Atherton,      Sergeant Ballantyne,  
                        Mrs. J. H. Walworth.

**300 SHORT STORIES  
AND SKETCHES.**

**500 BRIEF ARTICLES  
AND ANECDOTES.**

**250 Illustrations**

THE THIRD YEAR OF OUR YOUTH.

**The Official Church Paper for Young People.**

WHILE OUR YOUTH is a denominational paper it is conducted on the latest and most progressive journalistic principles, aiming to keep in thorough sympathy with the wants and tastes of young people, and at the same time emphasizing the vital importance of sincere Christian living.

Stories and articles of Travel, Adventure, Home, and School.

A Summary of each Week's News, with Maps and Portraits.

Out-door Sports, In-door Games, Puzzles, etc., in every number.

A Special Department for Girls; Fancy Work, Housekeeping, etc.

"The Journalist," an amateur paper written by the readers of Our Youth.

**A PAGE DEVOTED TO YOUNG PEOPLE'S SOCIETIES.**

Programmes, Plans of Work, Suggestions, and Reports.

Sixteen pages  
weekly.

**Only \$1 50 per year.**

Special rates  
to clubs

Sample Copies Free. Address

**PHILLIPS & HUNT, Publishers, 805 Broadway, N.Y.**

A SPLENDID WORK OF ENDURING VALUE.

# History of the Christian Church.

By GEORGE PARK FISHER, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University.

1 vol. 8vo, with maps, \$3 50.

*Rev. R. S. STORRS,  
D.D.*

"I am surprised that the author has been able to put such multitudes of facts, with analyses of opinions, definitions of tendencies, and concise personal sketches, into a narrative at once so graceful, graphic, and compact."

*Prof. PHILIP  
SCHAFF, LL.D.*

"Professor Fisher has completely succeeded in condensing the immense mass of material of his subject into one volume, and producing a most useful manual for students which meets a long-felt want."

*Prof. A. V. G. AL-  
LEN, Episcopal  
Divinity School,  
Cambridge, Mass.*

"It has the merit of being eminently readable, its conclusions rest on the widest research and the latest and best scholarship, it keeps a just sense of proportion in the treatment of topics, it is written in the interest of Christianity as a whole, and not of any one sect or church, it is so entirely impartial that it is not easy to discern the author's sympathies or his denominational attitude, and it has the great advantage in which the German hand-books, so long in use, are deficient, of dwelling at due length upon English and American church history. In short, it is a work which no one but a long and successful teacher of church history could have produced."

*Rev. Wm. M. TAY-  
LOR, D.D.*

"The author has supplied a great want in this book, and laid all busy men under a deep and lasting obligation."

## RECENT IMPORTANT WORKS:

### Fifteen Years in Yale Chapel.

1874-1886. By NOAH PORTER, D.D., LL.D. With portrait. Crown 8vo, \$2 50.

*Boston Saturday  
Evening Gazette.*

The Sermons are exceptionally well adapted for the perusal of thoughtful young men of all classes, and are calm, philosophical discussions of questions which have an important bearing on Theistic and Christian faith. They are timely and forcible arguments. They will strengthen the believer's faith in the acceptable truths of religion, and will give peace, no doubt, to many a wavering mind. Even those who reject their teachings must acknowledge that they are written in a spirit of toleration and fairness that is worthy of imitation.

### The Story of the Psalms.

By HENRY VAN DYKE, D.D. 12mo, \$1 50.

*Boston Post.*

One of the most stirring and uplifting of religious books. Its life, its ardor, its freshness of feeling, its vividness of narration are fascinating. Readers will no longer take the Psalms in order, ignorant of their meaning and of the circumstances under which they were written.

### The Religion of the Present and of the Future.

Sermons preached chiefly at Yale College. By THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, D.D., LL.D. With portrait. Crown 8vo, \$2 00.

*A NEW EDITION.*

This new addition of more than a score of ex-President Woolsey's discourses will be welcomed by all who appreciate the qualities which make these sermons pre-eminent—the direct application of truth, severe logical simplicity, and that eloquence which springs from unaffected earnestness and single-hearted sincerity.

### The Ethical Import of Darwinism.

By J. G. SCHURMAN, M. A., Sage Professor of Philosophy in Cornell University. 1 vol. 12mo, \$1 50.

*New York Post.*

Dr. Schurman's style is so clear and rich and easy that it is a pleasure to follow him. One finds in this book the excellences of a scholarly and candid and genuinely inquiring mind. The work deserves to be widely read.

\*\* These books are for sale by all Booksellers, or sent, post-paid, on receipt of price, by CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, Publishers, 743-745 Broadway, New York.